McIlvenna will compete in the zone 2 contest Sunday, March 16, at the American Legion, Post 324, headquarters, 257 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, at 2 p. m.

The State finals will be held in Faneuil Hall, Boston, Sunday, March 23, at 3 p. m. The awards are in memory of Jeremiah J. Twomey, of Lawrence Post.

Lawrence has been well represented in the past in these oratorical contests. Five students have reached the State finals and in 1946, Mrs. Doris (Letourneau) Bernardin, was the State winner and placed second in the national finals. Other students who placed in the State finals were: Claire Dowd, Rosalind O'Brien, Joan Flanagan, and John F. Murphy, Jr. The program is open to the public.

Chinese Workers Crushed Under Red Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1952

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of Labor is doing an excellent job of exposing Communist slavery and in bringing home to its members and the American people the true horrors of communism. It has done this by sending its own men to many parts of the world to gain first hand information from people of all walks of life about the operations of the world-wide Communist conspiracy.

The American Federation of Labor has taken the lead among private organizations in performing this excellent service for the American people in the fight against communism. It would be a great help in the battle to preserve civilization if other private organizations—civic, church, business, and professional—would follow the American Federation of Labor's lead in unearthing and combating the world-wide Communist apparatus.

A recent issue of the AFL-News Reporter shows how the Chinese worker is faring under communism. Working hours have been increased 2 to 4 hours a day. Wages have been decreased to as little as one-fifth of what they were formerly. Unemployment is rampant.

I include herewith an article which appeared in the March 5, 1952, issue of the AFL-News Reporter:

CHINA'S WORKERS ARE SUFFERING UNDER HEEL OF RED OPPRESSION

(By Wang Chung, leader of underground trade-union movement behind Communist China's iron curtain)

Under the banner of Russia's Cominform, the Chinese Communists are preparing for more wars in Asia—on a larger scale. More wars are coming in Asia. Today the only industries running full blast in China are the munitions industries and their accessories.

In Shanghai, the Communist aggressors are building new extensions of their small-arms factories, all of which are running day and night on double shift. The stockpiling of heavy Russian tanks, guns, and jet aircraft in Shanghai is frightening. The city's air is roaring daily with the sound of jet aircraft coursing across the sky.

SOVIET STEPS IN

What about the workers? When the Communists first entered Shanghai, their policy was business as usual. Within 3 months near-normal industrial production was reached. Then came expropriation.

With Communist backing, the workers in the privately owned—especially foreign-owned—plants demanded the power of control. The workers got that power; the plants were theirs, said the Communists.

Wages then were doubled or tripled and working hours were reduced. However, business fell off. The plant owners sought loans from Communist banks. Soon the employers went broke. Then the factories were taken over by Soviet authorities on the Communist-directed request of the workers. Retrenchment ensued. Next wages were slashed and working hours increased—also on the alleged request of the workers. The workers always managed to adopt unanimously resolutions of willingness to sacrifice their personal interests for the state. Even the slaves of the slave-labor camps in north China and Manchuria volunteer their services in writing.

How do the workers of China feel about this? Two years ago they were noncommittal. Today 95 percent of Chinese labor hates communism and everything it stands for. For one thing, working hours have increased from the former 8-to-10-hour day to 12 hours, with an additional 2-to-4-hour increase for munitions and other war plants.

Wages have been cut to the bone. Three years ago I was getting 600 pounds of rice per month for a 9-hour day. Six months ago I drew 200 pounds of rice per month for a 16-hour day.

Secondly, we were asked to liquidate the employer class. We did. Now lots of us are unemployed.

AGRARIAN REFORM

Third, farmers have been pitted against the landlord. Anyone who leases even half an acre of land is a landlord and may be arrested or shot. This is so-called agrarian reform, by which many people in the West have been fooled.

The state has now stepped in with a harsh cruelty far in excess of that of even the most heartless of landlords. I saw with my own eyes farmers paying three-quarters of their harvest to the Communist state in the form of taxes.

Fourth, the Communists are bent on destroying China's family system. Children are taught to denounce their parents in public. There is no sense of security from the police or MVD boys.

To compensate for what the Communists know to be the rapidly increasing opposition to their tactics a mass purge of dissident elements among all classes of the people in China was set in force through regulations passed on February 21, 1951. Since that date there has been going on what is probably the biggest wholesale slaughter of innocent people in the history of the world. Executions of the Chinese people take place both privately and in public, in some cases before huge crowds. The so-called trials of the people are very often broadcast so that all may be terrorized.

On April 27, 1951, the Communist police rounded up 60,000 persons in Shanghai alone. On May 1 the Communists executed 285 workers at one time in that city.

TEACHINGS DAMNED

And so, in the name of communism, socialism, or whatever you wish to call it, our people are dying, our families being destroyed, our Confucian teachings damned. In Soviet China falsehood is truth, blackmail is honor, bondage is freedom, hatred is love, war is peace.

Can there be any wonder that the Chinese workers resist? We shall resist and resist again and again until we are freemen in a free world.

Two years ago there suddenly appeared on the mainland and in Free China (Formosa) an organization, the Free China Labor League. The league has drawn tremendous encouragement and spiritual assistance from the American Federation of Labor and its free-trade-union committee.

Several thousand of our trade-union brothers have been arrested and shot, many of them for resisting or taking proper care of war-making plants so that they can no longer serve the enemies of the Chinese people.

Our underground workers in China are daily keeping alive the spirit of freedom and of friendship for America and other free lands. Chinese factory workers behind the iron curtain have come to know of such organizations as the American Federation of Labor. They are seeing the slave-labor maps. They are getting plenty of news about the free trade unions of the world because we get it to them through the tyrants' iron curtain.

The American Federation of Labor should never underestimate its importance in the world crisis. More than any government, more than any military group or big financial corporation, more than any political group, more than any official or unofficial propaganda organization, the American Federation of Labor, through its activities based on its shrewd insight into man's true hopes, has brought its influence to bear upon the Chinese people and given them hope in the present darkness.

Coastal Boundaries Fixing Needs Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 10, 1952

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in our RECORD the following editorial which appeared February 26, 1952, in one of the outstanding Democratic newspapers in the United States, the Los Angeles Daily News.

The article follows:

COASTAL BOUNDARIES FIXING NEEDS ACTION

It is important that the Congress pass at the earliest possible moment the resolution—House Joint Resolution 373, by SAM YORTY, Democrat, of Los Angeles—fixing the boundaries of the internal waters around the coasts of the United States and Alaska.

This is important because it would let the world know what we consider inland waters and high seas. This would settle the question of where foreign vessels could operate with respect to our shores and it would at the same time determine what we consider free air. Free air is all of the air over the high seas in which airplanes of all countries may operate without infringing the boundary rights of another nation.

The financial consideration involved here is subsidiary to the question of what we may and should defend as coastal waters, but even the financial aspect is more than negligible. For example, if any official American agency should cause damage to a foreign craft beyond 3 miles to seaward of the mean low tide line—a line now being determined—it might be liable to indemnification.

Under a recent ruling by the International Court of Justice at The Hague in the case of *Great Britain* v. *Norway*, involving the latter's fishing fleet, the Court found for Norway, which contended that her coastal boundaries followed the general outline of her coastal islands under certain conditions.

As Norway now has jurisdiction, as a result of that decision, within 3 miles to seaward of the new line all foreign fishing vessels would be barred from waters within that line without Norway's consent.

If America avails herself of such a decision to set up a new internal water line, as we think she should, it will also settle another matter of the utmost importance to both the Federal Government and to the State of California. We refer to the controversy over the tidelands.

Under a Supreme Court decision the Federal Government claims and holds a paramount interest in all submarine oil deposits within 3 miles seaward of the mean low tide line. The Government has stipulated that all deposits within such a line or under inland waters belong to the coastal States.

As a result of the dispute arising out of that decision approximately $40,000,000 in oil royalty funds from California have been tied up. If it is determined that this money shall go to the State approximately three-fourths of it will go into a fund for our beaches and parks.

It has been widely asserted, by persons who lacked information or were indifferent to the facts, that the oil companies want the States to have control of the tidelands because the oil companies can more easily control State governments. Oil companies do not care which level of government owns the tidelands. Some of them have recently expressed preference for Federal control. Even if they preferred State control it is not quite clear how they are going to handle Governor Warren or the legislature in a way that is illegal of unethical.

In the case of some cities, notably Long Beach, Federal ownership would mean a loss of millions of dollars to the community while State ownership would mean a continuance of present arrangements which greatly help the cities and keep down taxes.

The primary consideration is American defense. The second consideration is equity. Finally it is important to have the matter settled.

Why the Church Opposes Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1952

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon entitled "Why the Church Opposes Universal Military Training," by Rev. Robert E. Wagner, minister of the Methodist Church, Mitchell, S. Dak., on February 3, 1952.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every once in a while a preacher is confronted with the problem of whether or not a topic which begs for discussion is a proper one for the theme of a sermon. Such was my problem on the topic of universal military training.

One of the major emphases of both the Old and the New Testaments is "peace among men." The greatest destroyer of both the moral and the material resources of man in all history has been war. If any modern problem has to do with war and peace, it is for that reason a religious problem, add one which is not only proper for the concern of the churches but which demands their concern. Certainly universal military training is such a modern problem.

And so, because both the Old and New Testaments require a practical and realistic religious concern for peace and because the Methodist Church has officially declared its position on universal military training, I want to take the rest of this service to consider with you this vitally important and deeply religious subject.

Since before the end of World War II the Armed Forces of the United States have been making an all-out, determined, ruthless drive to force a change in United States policy and get the European plan of universal military training adopted here. The armed services have used millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money—money which we thought was being used for defense—for propaganda in favor of UMT. Every conceivable pressure has been used on Congress to force passage of universal military training legislation. A tight censorship was imposed on all officers who disagreed with Pentagon policy. Yet after 8 years of such pressure as no other suggested legislation has ever had in this country, we still do not have universal military training. The whole set of American opinion and practice is against it.

Yet the proponents of UMT have not quit. Unable to get a clear-cut law for UMT through Congress, they are inching their way toward it by devious means. Last June Congress passed a "package" law which combined the extension of Selective Service with a plan to force a decision on UMT; at the next session. That decision is now before Congress in the form of a report which must be either accepted or rejected.

There are at least four reasons why universal military training should not be adopted by this country. First, because it is a military booby-trap. Second, because it strengthens the greatest, immediate threat to the American way of life, namely, military dictatorship. Third, because it will be a moral hazard to every generation of American youth from now on forever. Fourth, because it is the worship of the pagan god of war rather than the worship of the God of Jesus.

Let's look at these accusations.

The only reason given for UMT is that in the kind of a world in which we live, America must be militarily strong to protect herself and all free people from Communist aggression. In this practically all our people agree. It is then said, "universal military training will make America militarily strong." People are then supposed to say, "all right, then, whether we like it or not, I guess we've got to have it."

The catch is, nobody can show how universal military training will make America militarily strong. Both experience and common sense show that UMT is a military booby-trap.

Every European country which was defeated in the last world war had practiced UMT for years before the war. In fact, history shows that universal military training has neither prevented nor won wars.

Just a little common sense can show the folly of military dependence on 6 months of UMT. The plan is to take every 18-year-old boy, give him 6 months in a military camp, then turn him loose into civilian life with a 7½-year Reserve leash on him.

During those 6 months in camp he will get only basic training—and that will be poorly learned because he knows he will not have to use it after his 6-months' stint is up. Then he goes back home. In 3 months he will have become softened to civilian life. If he is ever needed again after that in the defense of his country, he will have to be trained all over again. He will have to be hardened to field life all over again. He will have to be assigned to a unit and learn to work with a team all over again. He will have to be supplied with new, improved weapons and learn to use them all over again. Neither he nor his country will have gained anything by his previous 6-months training.

And, as if that were not bad enough, a big proportion of the Nation's standing army which, without UMT might have been prepared and fit as combat teams to repel aggression, will instead be employed as drill sergeants for 18-year-olds on a 6-month's stretch.

Whenever America relies for its defense on masses of 18-year-old boys doing squads right and squads left it has fallen into a military booby trap. We may be able to fool ourselves with that kind of foolishness, but we can never scare those enemies who long for the destruction of our country.

Even General MacArthur, the only general, incidentally, that the Pentagon seems unable to muzzle with its gag rules, said recently to the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate: "If I were considering the problem [that is, of UMT] I would wait and get through the emergency that faces us now. * * * I believe the thing should be carefully studied, Senator, after we get over this present crisis that exists."

The fact is, universal military training will produce not one trained soldier.

In the second place, universal military training strengthens the greatest, immediate threat to the American way of life, namely, military dictatorship.

Most American people consider communism as the greatest threat to the American way of life. And, indeed, communism is the most dangerous external enemy America and Christianity have. Communism, if it could, would destroy everything we hold sacred.

But so would militarism destroy the American way of life. Militarism and freedom are opposites. And militarism is a far greater, immediate threat to the American way of life than is communism.

I am not a pacifist. I believe that in this kind of a world, military force is still necessary.

But the job of the military is to protect a country, not to rule it.

The military should be run for the benefit of the country, and not the country run for the benefit of the military. Here in our own America we have come mighty close to putting the cart before the horse.

We decry the militarism that brought Germany and Italy and Japan to disgrace and destruction. But we are fast approaching the same kind of military dictatorship in this Nation.

If this seems like too strong a charge, look at some of the evidence.

Look at taxes. Taxes in this country are fast approaching the stifling point. Everybody, nearly, is aware of this. Politicians are having a field day denouncing taxes and deploring Government expenses.

There is going to be a great hue and cry about inefficiency and waste in the Government. And no doubt there is plenty of it to cry about. Certainly it should be wiped out.

But if every bit of inefficiency and waste in the regular, civilian governmental processes were completely eliminated it would make only a small fraction of difference in your taxes.

The lion's share of our Federal expense is for the military and for interest on the national debt.

Ernest K. Lindley writing in Newsweek of January 28, this year analyzed President Truman's budget recommendations to Congress. He wrote: "From 76 to 78 cents of every dollar of proposed expenditure is for defense. An additional 12 cents plus out of each dollar will go to pay the cost of previous wars, 7 cents for interest on the national debt and 5 cents for services to veterans."

As an example of this, the Department of Agriculture—including its operating expenses, its subsidy payment to farmers, its

a few lines from our association's 1947 yearbook entitled "Schools for a New World." This book was prepared by a commission appointed in 1945 to survey the impact of the A-bomb and atomic energy upon the schools. Congressman SHAFER's quotation from this book is unfortunate from his own point of view. It shows that he is either the victim of a careless reviewer or has been too hasty in his own reading. He undertakes to draw the inference from this excerpt that the American Association of School Administrators wanted the schools to teach socialism, whereas the reverse was recommended. For had the Congressman only taken the time to read the sentence immediately preceding his quotation, he would have found these words: "It (the economic problem of atomic energy) is, in the final analysis, the issue of retaining as much individual freedom as possible within the framework of an economy of private enterprise and competitive opportunity while giving unreserved priority to the unity and well-being of our society as a whole."

The Congressman is obviously unfamiliar with the 87-year history of the American Association of School Administrators. Had he been more familiar he would have known that this association together with the American Medical Association and other professional and civic groups opposed actively in 1950 the President's Reorganization Plan No. 27 which in the minds of a good many thoughtful people would have advanced the cause of socialized medicine and would have scrambled education with social welfare in a proposed cabinet department of health, education, and welfare. Had he done a little more thoughtful research he would have discovered that the association's platform, which embodies its official policies, contains, along with two or three similar statements, the following: "As educators we believe that the American democratic way of life may be perpetuated * * * through teaching the individual how free America permits him to choose and plan his own goals, provides him increasing equality of opportunity to reach these goals, allows him to keep the rewards for his work, and matches these privileges with serious duties of citizenship."

Had he made a more thorough inquiry he would have learned that at our just concluded regional conventions in St. Louis and Los Angeles congratulatory telegrams of greeting and appreciation were read from the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the president of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Superintendent Virgil M. Rogers, of Battle Creek, is known from coast to coast as one of the ablest school administrators in the Nation. This is attested by his recent election to the presidency of the American Association of School Administrators. His 25-year record as a superintendent in several States of the Union, during which time he has been identified with the activities of the American Legion, the Rotary Club, and several chambers of commerce, speaks for itself and needs no defense from anyone. It is regrettable that Congressman SHAFER should remain so clearly uniformed about the superintendent of schools in his own home town.

Who's Better Off?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1952

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in this month of March, most American families have had to check over their records and check out their cash in order to estimate and pay the huge tax bill which has been imposed upon them. Both income and outgo have been at high level. Administration experts are chanting a refrain, designed to appeal to voters, to the effect that farmers, working, business, and professional men, and corporations have never been so well off.

Caution would dictate that we peer through the mist of political propaganda in an effort to see just where we are before we accept the rosy estimates of those who have a natural desire to justify the frantic spending programs of past years.

If we look coldly and impersonally at the position of the average American family, it becomes apparent that unless its income has nearly tripled in recent years, it has not more than held its own, economically speaking.

Even where the family income has increased over 200 percent, it has lost ground unless it is in the lower- or middle-income bracket.

If we take as an average family, a married couple with two children, the figures set forth in a recent issue of Tax Outlook reveal this disheartening situation.

Such a family with a $3,000 annual income 12 years ago, after paying taxes, then could buy as much as it can today with the family income at $6,500, so devastating are the combined effects of tax increases and inflation. After subtracting the income tax and making allowance for price increases, the family is just where it was with $3,000 to spend in 1939.

A $10,000 income, 12 years ago, made possible the same scale of living that $25,000 a year provides in 1952, and the higher the income level, the worse the comparison becomes.

One with a net income of $100,000 in 1939, after paying taxes, had $68,000 left to spend. Today to be as well off, the same man would have to earn $950,000 during the year, of which Uncle Sam would get $825,000 in taxes. What such a very rich individual would have left to spend, would buy about what the $68,000 did in 1939.

Well, if families fare poorly these days, how about corporations?

Here is an example of how one of the big successful corporations, General Motors, fared this past year.

According to its March 14 report, it paid $1,548,000,000 in taxes last year, which is about four times as much as the dividends it distributed to stock holders—$363,000,000. In fact, the amount of taxes was approaching the figure of $1,996,000,000, which was the total of all the wages and salaries received by the corporation's officers and employees, who in turn paid a large slice of what they received to Uncle Sam. Everyone who bought a car or anything that General Motors manufactured, also paid a tax on the purchase. Pyramiding taxes upon taxes plays havoc with prices.

Then, the huge national debt, extravagance, waste, and corruption in Government all contribute to inflation and the demand for more and more taxes.

The truth which emerges through the smoke screen of Fair Deal demagogy is undeniable. Every American breadwinner is carrying a terrible tax burden—not just the shrinking ranks of the very rich.

A recent reliable compilation shows that in the case of an average family with an annual income of less than $1,000 the percentage taken by taxes is 23 percent. If the income is from $2,000 to $3,000, 30 percent is taken in taxes; at $5,000, the level is 33 percent; and so on up.

In spite of the great strides made by science, American initiative and production in recent years, we are failing to derive the great benefit from these advances that they could bring to us were it not for the waste, inefficiency, and corruption that have saddled us with inflation and destructive taxation.

No, the average American should be much better off, but he is not. He cannot be until we reduce his tax burden and balance the Federal budget. Then, and only then, will he reap the full benefits of the technical advances of the last few years.

Tidelands Hearings in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 18, 1952

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by Mr. Ed Ainsworth, the very distinguished Los Angeles Times writer, and an editorial from the ably edited Los Angeles Mirror, point up the need for early congressional action relative to the fixing of the seaward limits of our inland waters. If Congress fails to act, the executive department will proceed with its attempt to usurp legislative powers and will continue to claim the right to fix these important boundaries. The Justice Department will attempt to have them fixed in such a manner as to get the control of close inshore oil, irrespective of the other consequences of its action.

I hope my resolution, House Joint Resolution 373, fixing the seaward boundaries of our inland waters in accordance with international law, will soon be acted upon. The article and editorial previously referred to follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 23, 1952]

BATTLE ON TIDELANDS TO ERUPT TOMORROW—LOS ANGELES HEARING TO SEE STATE AND UNITED STATES CLASH ON OWNERSHIP OF OIL-RICH AREA

(By Ed Ainsworth)

Now the $40,000,000,000 tidelands battle shifts to Los Angeles. Hearings open here tomorrow in the titanic struggle between State and Federal forces over control of the rich, oil-bearing submerged lands off the shores of California and other States.

The arena will be the court room of the States circuit court of appeals on the sixteenth floor of the Federal Building.

The gladiators will be counsel for the sovereign State of California and the Federal Government of the United States of America.

CHIEF QUESTION

Presiding over it all will be William H. Davis, of New York, master in chancery for the Supreme Court of the United States.

The chief question at issue will be:

Where runs the boundary line of the United States along the coast of California?

On that question hinges the future status of billions of dollars of as yet unextracted oil from ancient geologic beds beneath the Pacific Ocean.

OTHER STATES WATCH

Watching the contest will be all the States of the Union, particularly Texas and Louisiana because of their comparable positions, as well as virtually all of the civilized nations of the earth.

For on the final edicts to emerge as the result of Master Davis' hearings will depend the disposition of the oil that has been estimated to be worth as much as $40,000,000,000, and also the control of other valuable natural resources hidden under the marginal sea.

The objective of the master in chancery is to gather material for the Supreme Court to determine a question which, incredible as it seems, never has been decided in the entire history of the Nation—where the seaward boundaries of the United States lie.

IMPERATIVE MATTER

This matter has become imperative since the revolutionary ruling of the United States Supreme Court in 1947 that the United States Government, rather than each State, has a paramount right in the submerged lands of the marginal sea.

The question then arose: Where is this area of paramount rights?

Nobody could answer exactly.

The United States Justice Department said one thing.

California and the other States said something else.

MASTER APPOINTED

So the Supreme Court appointed a master in chancery to take testimony on the vital points involved.

The main question in California revolves around the matter of internal waters.

The United States Justice Department has conceded that the United States has no paramount rights in the internal waters and that these are unquestionably within the jurisdiction of the State.

But, by interpretation and definition, United States Attorney General McGrath is seeking to claim Federal jurisdiction and paramount powers over submerged areas in bays and elsewhere which California contends are historically, economically, and geographically inland waters.

BATTLE TO BEGIN

So, tomorrow at 10 a. m., in the Federal Building, the latest round in the battle will begin.

Fact witnesses will predominate.

The United States Attorney General and the attorney general of California, already in Washington, have presented to Master Davis a mass of testimony on international law, history, and geography concerning the California coast line.

Now it is the turn of California witnesses, who, through their own intimate knowledge of conditions along the coast, can testify compellingly of the accepted definitions of bays, inland waters, and marginal seas.

In charge of the case for the State of California will be Assistant Attorney General Everett W. Mattoon, who has devoted years to its preparation, although Attorney General Edmund G. Brown is expected to be present also. Assisting Mattoon will be Assistant Attorney General Frank J. Mackin and two representatives of the State lands commission, Col. R. W. Putnam and J. Stuart Watson.

Representing United States Attorney General McGrath will be Robert Vaughn and John F. Davis, special assistants to the United States Attorney General, and George S. Swarth, attorney, plus several technical assistants.

It will be the witnesses, however, who will bring a real nautical flavor into the hearings.

WITNESSES FROM SEA

Old sea captains and pilots will be there. Fishermen and water-taxi operators will add their bits of lore and experience.

Ship architects and ship builders will describe the different kinds of craft used for different kinds of conditions in inland waters and elsewhere.

There will be law enforcement officers who have dealt with piracy on the high seas. Salvage crews will tell of their interpretation of different kinds of sea water and sea bottom in relation to the pertinent questions at issue.

CALIFORNIA'S AIM

The main purpose of the State of California will be to show that, traditionally, the waters inside the chain of Channel Islands stretching along parallel to the California coast—San Clemente, Santa Catalina, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, and the others—have been inland waters and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the State. It will be pointed out that all of the islands form parts of the counties off which they lie, and that commercially they have been considered an integral part of the State's activities.

TESTIMONY

The United States Attorney General will be privileged to put on rebuttal witnesses if he cares to do so. The bulk of the Government's case already has been presented in Washington.

California, at the Washington sessions in February, offered the testimony of Judge Manley O. Hudson, of Harvard, on international law; Gerald C. Fitzgerald on geography and physical characteristics of the California coast; and Dr. John Caughey on the historical factors.

COULD FOLLOW RULING

The matter of international law recently has entered strongly into the case because of a ruling by the International Court of Justice at The Hague on the question of national boundaries in a case between Great Britain and Norway. In supporting the position of Norway—which had been backed by California and opposed by the United States Attorney General—the World Court dealt a serious blow to the contentions of United States Attorney General McGrath in the tidelands case.

Under the World Court's ruling the United States on its own volition now could place its boundary line along the outer edge of the California Channel Islands in conformity with international law. But Attorney General McGrath will not accede to this because it would mean giving up the narrow definition of the coast line under which the United States seeks to seize oil-bearing submerged lands.

California, however, is greatly encouraged by the World Court action in its effort to have defined as "inland waters"—and therefore as under State rather than Federal jurisdiction—all of the waters within the line of the Channel Islands. In fact, Representative SAM YORTY, of Los Angeles, has introduced a bill in Congress to compel the establishment of the largest seaward boundary possible for the United States which of course, would include the Channel Island line.

The hearing tomorrow before the special master will represent one climax of the $40,000,000,000 conflict.

[From the Los Angeles Mirror of March 19, 1952]

FEDERAL TIDELANDS PLEA TORPEDOED

Congressman SAM YORTY apparently has knocked the Federal Government's case full of holes in the tidelands oil controversy.

The law and plain horse sense are on YORTY's side. The Federal Government proposes to follow shore-line contours in fixing the limit of State jurisdiction, but this is ridiculous in law or in logic.

For instance, large portions of deeply indented, wide United States bays would be declared international waters (open to Soviet naval maneuvers, for instance) if the Federal contention is upheld. Moreover, the International Court recently ruled that offshore jurisdiction lines should be determined by lines drawn between the outermost headlands, rather than following shore contours.

The primary considerations of national defense, as well as the weight of established international law, make the Federal contention wrong.

Story of the Development of the Cold-Weather Boot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1952

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 24, 1952, I had the happy privilege of attending the ceremonies at the United States naval supply activities, New York, wherein two great Americans, Salvatore V. Gianola and Dominick E. Maglio, received the Distinguished Civilian Service Awards, approved by the Secretary of the Navy on February 13, 1952.

The Distinguished Civilian Service Award is the highest civilian honorary award bestowed by the Navy. It consists of a lapel emblem, a citation, and certificate signed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Salvatore V. Gianola and Dominick E. Maglio, who I am proud to say are residents of my home borough, Brooklyn, received this high award for inventing the cold-weather boot, which has already saved thousands of lives in Korea. This invention is probably the greatest achievement of this era.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following:

STORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLD WEATHER BOOT

During World War II, seamen operating aboard merchant marine vessels and on Navy submarines demonstrated that the existing cold-weather clothing was inadequate. Thus it was that in 1944, the Navy's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts assigned to the Clothing Supply Office, Brooklyn, the task of improving cold-weather gear.

In order to determine what their exact problems would be, Mr. Salvatore V. Gianola and Mr. Dominick E. Maglio, employees of the Clothing Supply Office's Research and Development Division, studied all available literature on the subject. By 1947, they determined that existing knowledge about cold-weather gear was inaccurate and inadequate for their purposes. They then set about to develop their own theory.

It was during this time, that Mr. Gianola conceived the idea of applying the relatively unknown moisture-barrier principle to the development of the Navy's cold-weather boot.

The moisture-barrier principle was utilized in the development of the boot and clothing because when moist body vapors

"I was wrong there," said the Commissioner happily. "The Army weeded out the addicts before they got in. They trained the boys well, built up a fine morale. And the provost marshals did a first-rate job of policing."

"What about the big rise in teen-age addiction here and in other countries? Did you foresee that?" I inquired.

"No, I didn't."

"Have you any ideas as to why it happened?"

"I've been trying hard to find out the answer to that. I haven't learned yet."

Commemorative Stamp for Grand Coulee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1952

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an announcement by the Post Office Department of the issuance of a Grand Coulee Dam commemorative postage stamp.

This stamp is being issued in commemoration of 50 years of Federal partnership with the Western States and their people in the development of the West's water resources. Since the Reclamation Act of 1902 was enacted, facilities have been constructed to supply irrigation water to more than 6,000,000 acres of arid western land. Last year alone, more than $600,000,000 worth of crops were harvested from this land. At the same time, a total of 4,133,700 kilowatts of hydroelectric generating capacity have been installed to utilize the limitless energy of falling water as it seeks its way to the ocean from the high mountain ranges of the West.

We people in the Pacific Northwest are fortunate in having one of the great rivers in the world, the Columbia, draining the basin between the crests of the Cascades and the Rocky Mountains. In my own State of Washington, the greatest dam, hydroelectric plant, and pumping plant in the world have been erected by the Federal Government to harness the resources of that stream in order to supply water for more than a million acres of land on the Columbia Basin reclamation project and hydroelectric power for all of the Northwest.

Thus, Grand Coulee Dam is a fitting symbol of the progress which has been made in reclamation in the last half century and I am proud that it has been selected for portrayal on the anniversary stamp.

The Post Office Department announcement follows:

Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson today announced that the 3-cent Grand Coulee Dam commemorative postage stamp will go on sale at Grand Coulee, Wash., on May 15, 1952. The issuance of this stamp will be preliminary to a celebration which the people of the Columbia Basin are planning from May 22 to June 1, in observance of the first integrated operation of the big million-acre Columbia Basin reclamation project. This stamp is being issued in commemoration of 50 years of Federal cooperation with the West in developing the resources of the rivers and streams which head up among the mountain ranges between the Missouri River and the Pacific Ocean. Grand Coulee Dam is the key structure in the great Columbia Basin reclamation project in central Washington State. It is the largest concrete dam in the world and also boasts the largest hydroelectric plant and water pumps.

At the same time Mr. Donaldson made available the description of the Grand Coulee Dam stamp. It will be 0.84 by 1.44 inches in dimensions, arranged horizontally with a double outline frame, printed by the rotary process, electric-eye perforated, and issued in sheets of 50. The color of the stamp will be announced later. An initial printing order of 110,000,000 Grand Coulee Dam commemorative stamps has been authorized.

The central design of the stamp is a scene of Grand Coulee Dam, showing the spillway. An irrigation farmer at work is shown on the left side of the stamp, and on the right side appears a power transmission line and towers, typifying the two principal benefits of this project. The wording "U. S. Postage" is shown at the top center of the design with the denomination "3 cents" in each upper corner, in white face roman. The title "Grand Coulee Dam," in white face gothic appears in the lower part of the central design and in a ribbon, which frames the bottom of the central design, is the wording "1902 Reclamation 1952," in dark modified roman. The words "Irrigation" and "Power" appear in the lower left and right corners, respectively, in white face gothic.

Stamp collectors desiring first-day cancellations of this stamp may send a limited number of addressed envelopes, not in excess of 10, to the postmaster, Spokane, Wash., where the preliminary work will be done, after which the covers will be forwarded to Grand Coulee, Wash., for cancellation, etc. All money order remittances should be made payable to the postmaster, Spokane, Wash. An enclosure of medium weight should be placed in each envelope and the flap either sealed or turned in. The outside envelope to the postmaster should be endorsed "First Day Covers."

Racial and Religious Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1952

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1952, contains a discussion between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] during which the gentleman from Mississippi made certain remarks which were construed as derogatory to the people of the Jewish race. I am happy to note that in the RECORD of March 17, 1952, on page 2433, the gentleman from Indiana has answered these comments, and I wish to concur wholeheartedly with the views expressed by him.

I was not present on the floor of the House at the moment that the gentleman from Mississippi made his remarks, though I did enter the Chamber a few moments later. Despite that, a newspaperman in my home district, known for his consistent stand in defense of Communist policies and principles, has seized upon that occasion to spread the claim that by my silence, I have indicated by tacit agreement with the views expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi. Such an accusation is obviously dishonest and unfair, and quite characteristic of Communist tactics. I have always abhorred all appeals to race and religious prejudices as un-American and inconsistent with our principles of democracy. I have never changed my position on that principle and any contrary inference is, as I have previously stated, untrue and without any basis of fact.

The Submerged Lands Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 27, 1952

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Oil Royalties for Schools, Urges HILL," published in the Cooperative Consumer of March 14. The Cooperative Consumer is the official organ of the Cooperative League of the United States of America. I submit it in connection with the oil-for-education amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20. The amendment is sponsored by me and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Tidelands Give-Away Scandal Might Endanger Oil Industry," written by Robert T. Vanderpoel, and published in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 21, 1952.

I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a transcript of a portion of the broadcast of Mr. Frank Edwards, one of the Nation's foremost news commentators, over the Mutual Broadcasting System on March 21. It relates to the oil for education amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20. I commend to every member of the Senate a reading of Mr. Edwards' excellent and timely remarks regarding the crisis in America's schools.

There being no objection, the articles and transcript of radio broadcast were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cooperative Consumer of March 14, 1952]

OIL ROYALTIES FOR SCHOOLS, URGES HILL—UNDERSEA WEALTH SHOULD GO FOR EDUCATION, HE DECLARES—VARIETY OF SCHEMES

Rather suddenly, a $50,000,000,000 inheritance has been dropped in our laps. People of the United States own 15,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil and 140,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas—buried beneath the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean.

We haven't yet made up our minds what to do with it, comments Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, writing in Harper's.

We're still a little dazed, and like any man who suddenly becomes rich, we find ourselves "surrounded by new faces—people anxious to tell about their pet projects, personal needs, and get-rich-quick schemes.

"Many proposals have been put forward for getting rid of these $50,000,000,000. The most fantastic of them all, for some strange reason, is the one most in danger of acceptance.

"This," says Senator HILL, "is the suggestion that Senators and Representatives of the 48 States disregard the decisions of our highest court and make an outright gift of the bulk of this oil and gas to three States—California, Texas, and Louisiana.

"With the best legal talent that ample funds could employ, the three States put forward their claims for these undersea resources in the Supreme Court—and lost. Now this dissatisfied minority of States, with the help of private oil interests, is waging a relentless campaign to get this national wealth for themselves by means of a bill in Congress."

They have pushed their bill through the House. It is the same give-away bill the President vetoed 5 years ago—before Federal title was clearly established. This "biggest gift in history" is now before the Senate.

EDUCATION AMENDMENT

HILL and 17 other Senators from all parts of the country and both parties are sponsoring an oil-for-education amendment. This proposes: (1) Federal control by Departments of Interior and Defense; (2) use of royalties from off-shore oil for national defense during this emergency and for grants to primary, secondary, and higher educational institutions once the emergency ends.

To get our public schools going, HILL reminds us, we sold part of the national domain. Now they are threatened by shortages of funds just when we need more teachers, agriculturists, scientists, engineers, doctors, and better equipped professional and business leaders.

HILL urges that the old solution be applied to the new problem—provide funds from sale of underseas oil and gas that now belong to all the people.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of March 21, 1952]

TIDELANDS GIVE-AWAY SCANDAL MIGHT ENDANGER OIL INDUSTRY

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

The Supreme Court has ruled that title to off-shore oil lands rests with the Federal Government and not with the individual States.

The decision makes sense to the average American, yet a great campaign has been under way to get Congress to give up this valuable right belonging to all the people to the individual States, less than a half dozen in number. The States involved quite naturally have fought for this rich plum, estimated to be worth between $40,000,000,000 and $50,000,000,000.

Some of the interested oil companies, for less obvious reasons, also have fought for turning these lands over to the States. The presumption has been that they believe they could work out better deals for exploiting these properties with the various State governments than they could with the Federal Government.

Just why anyone else should favor the give-away plan remains still more obscure, yet the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce this week issued a farfetched statement to the effect that the Federal Government might claim title to lands underlying Illinois waterways and other inland waters if it chooses to take ownership of the tidelands.

The facts, as stated, are not that the Federal Government chooses to claim ownership but that the Supreme Court of the land has declared that that is where ownership lies.

It would make more sense to suggest that if selfish groups can pressure Congress into giving up the title which the Federal Government has to these lands, it might not be long before other selfish groups were endeavoring to get bills passed relinquishing ownership of the national parks to either State Governments or maybe private interests for exploitation.

It is difficult to understand why an organization such as the Illinois Chamber of Commerce should step into the fight, why it should line itself up on the side that is contrary to the national welfare and why it should offer such specious arguments as possible Federal claims over Illinois inland waterways.

The chamber complains of the failure of the Federal Government to balance its budget and yet proposes that voluntarily Congress turn over this great national asset. Such behavior doesn't make much sense. Inevitably it must give rise to a charge of hypocrisy.

I am very sure that if Congress should hand over this asset of all the people, it would develop into one of the worst scandals in this country's history and might very well lead to demands for nationalization of the industry that played a part in the $50,000,000,000 give-away.

[Portion of Broadcast by Mr. Frank Edwards]

EVERYWHERE, U. S. A.—The deterioration of America's educational system has been such a gradual process that it has sneaked up on us. But the deterioration is there as the records show.

Since the outbreak of the Korean war, more than 300,000 American boys have been rejected by the military because they failed to meet the intelligence and literacy tests. This Army of unusuables is the product of a scholastic breakdown. Crowded schools, not enough teachers, inadequate facilities. The net result is mass illiteracy and gradual lowering of the mental levels of American youth.

For example, Kevil, Ky., where the five-room brick schoolhouse which served 120 children in June of last year is now trying to serve more than 300.

In the Deptford School District in Chatham County, Ga., school authorities and parents are keeping their fingers crossed. A former shipyard office building, which was a temporary structure 10 years ago * * * now has 10 schoolrooms on its second floor. Officials fear that the weight of so many children will prove too much for the frail structure * * * may cause it to collapse. Yet they must use it at the risk of the children's lives, since they have no other building available.

Another classic example of education under distress conditions is this school at Kamiah, Idaho. It is a three-story deadfall waiting for a moment of disaster. The walls have spread, plaster is falling off, rain seeps through the rickety roof. The children on the third floor can look out through the cracks in the bulging walls. On windy days, the school authorities send the 200 students home for fear the building will collapse. Sections of some of the floors are roped off because they are sagging and dangerous.

Throughout the Nation there are countless examples similar in many respect to these which I have just cited to you. Communities are unable to build or repair because they have reached the limit of taxation on property. Home owners and farm owners must not be subjected to confiscatory taxation. * * * And yet, America must not permit its school system to decay.

Millions of dollars are needed to repair the ravages already affecting our schools * * * and more millions to keep better schools in operation.

The job can be done without increasing taxes one dime. The job can be done by using one public property to support another.

The American public owns about $50,000,000,000 worth of oil and other minerals beneath the shallow coastal waters of this country * * * the so-called tidelands oil.

The oil lobby, representing the rich and powerful oil interests, is working feverishly to get control of that vast treasure. They want your Senators to let them exploit this public property for private profit.

Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, wants to keep possession of that tidelands oil for the benefit of the school kids * * * now and for generations to come * * * to use the proceeds from the oil to build and maintain a real educational system for every little American.

Here is a list of the Senators who are in favor of using tidelands oil for American schools: HILL and SPARKMAN, of Alabama; MORSE, of Oregon; BENTON, of Connecticut; TOBEY, of New Hampshire; NEELY, of West Virginia; KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; GILLETTE, of Iowa; LEHMAN, of New York; MURRAY, of Montana; LANGER, of North Dakota; MOODY, of Michigan; AIKEN, of Vermont; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; DOUGLAS, of Illinois; and CASE, of South Dakota.

Nineteen Senators who want to use tidelands oil to support better schools for America. These men need your help to defeat the oil lobby when the matter comes to a vote early next week. You can help if you write or wire your Senator at once * * * urging him to support the Hill amendment.

Army in Far East Command Has Converted Over 200,000 Tons of World War II Equipment to Usable Condition, at a Saving to American Taxpayers of Over $1,000,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1952

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, we read headline stories about waste and extravagance in the armed services. Some of these stories are justified and some of them are found to be grossly exaggerated. The Hébert subcommittee, of which I am a member, has uncovered a number of inefficient and expensive practices in connection with all phases of procurement. Many of these have

the State Department found it necessary to go to Geneva and ask in effect "May we please do what Congress has instructed us to do?"

Was this merely consultation?

GATT voted on the question. It sustained the United States a second time.

If we were willing to abide by these decisions when they favored us, what will it make of us if we refuse when they go against us?

The State Department's letter lets us know what they themselves say. Figuratively, the cat has tired of playing and is now ready to dispose of the mouse. Says Mr. McFall:

"Respect for international undertakings in the case of Czechoslovakia, as in the case of termination of our bilateral commercial agreement with the U. S. S. R., required that certain procedures be observed in accomplishing the termination."

The teeth are beginning to show, but it is necessary to look closely. "Certain procedures" must "be observed," Mr. McFall says. These procedures, however, include the right of the other member nations of GATT to vote us down, to deny our petitions or to sustain those who complain against us. Remember, Mr. SECREST, that while "It must be emphasized that the parties to the agreement cannot overrule acts of Congress or of the Executive," the contracting parties to the agreement "do have the right to consult." This right of consultation includes these certain procedures that contain the quite effective power of review.

What would have been our position had we not consulted in the two cases mentioned and had we not followed the decisions of GATT? The State Department has rather definite ideas on this. In his letter, Mr. McFall says:

"To have ignored these undertakings (read 'obligations') would have given the Soviet bloc a strong propaganda theme against the United States."

Again, farther on, in assessing the possible effect of a withdrawal by the United States from GATT, he says:

"The blow to our allies would not be economic alone. In other countries, the inconsistency of our giving with one hand, through the Mutual Defense Assistance Program and through point 4, while taking away with the other would raise fundamental doubts regarding the bases of our leadership in the free world. These developments would affect both the ability and the willingness of our allies to make the sacrifices and readjustments that we are urging upon them."

There you have the sanctions of GATT.

It is precisely because we should honor our agreements that membership in GATT is a very serious matter. It is precisely because we should carry out our obligations and not flout them that GATT represents something far beyond the right to consult. Either we enter our international agreements in good faith, with full intention to meet our commitments, or we play fast and loose in our international relations. Which position does the State Department occupy? When they say that we are not bound by GATT, that we can withdraw, what sort of picture do they mean to draw of Uncle Sam in his conduct of international affairs? Do they wish us to stand by GATT when GATT supports us but to walk out if GATT goes against us?

If not, then GATT exercises a power of review as tight as any. Yes, we can walk out. Certainly, we can behave execrably; we can be international heels. Is that the significance of the State Department's argument?

If not, then we are indeed bound by GATT. This was what I assumed in the radio address, because I assumed that Uncle Sam honors his agreements. I still assume it. I assume that when we give our word in an international agreement we mean to carry it out in good faith and to abide by the rules and procedures and by the decisions arrived at in accordance with those procedures, whether they go in our favor or against us. That is why we should be careful of the kind of agreement we enter into; and the best way to be careful in these foreign agreements is to follow the constitutional processes.

Under these circumstances it is clear that through our entry into GATT we have by an international agreement de facto bestowed the right of review by an international body over official acts of our Congress and our Executive.

At no point have I said, Mr. SECREST, that we should never do this. We have done it in other spheres within certain limitations. What I have said is that the State Department in taking us into GATT has done so outside the treaty-making powers of the Executive and the Senate, and without specific legislative authority. I pointed out in my address that before we entered the United Nations, Congress passed the United National Participation Act, approved December 20, 1945. Also before joining the so-called World Court, the Senate ratified our action by passing a resolution of adherence, setting forth the conditions of our acceptance of its jurisdiction. Other instances could have been cited, among them membership in the International Labor Organization, the way to which was paved by a resolution of the Seventy-third Congress.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade lacks such legislative ratification in those of its parts that go beyond section 350, previously mentioned, which is the only legislative source of authority that underlies the trade-agreements program. Mr. McFall bases authority for the broader provisions of GATT on the Presidential power to conduct foreign relations.

However, the Constitution grants to Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations" (art. 1, sec. 8).

The upshot is that according to the State Department the Executive may go beyond the delegated power provided in the section 350 amendment of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Trade Agreements Act) to enter into trade agreements for the 50-percent adjustment of the tariff and a few related steps. For this enlarged power the President, according to the State Department, needs no additional authorization from the Congress or from the Senate alone.

This places the State Department, as the righ arm of the Executive in conducting foreign relations, in the position of making broad international executive agreements which in the usages, practices, and realities of international relations fritter away our national sovereignty just as surely and effectively as would a treaty, concurred in by the Senate. Since a treaty may at least be denounced and abrogated, there is recourse; while in the exercise of the alleged powers of the executive in international relations, there is none.

The entire effort of the State Department has trended toward the complete elimination of any legislative voice in the regulation of our trade. Neither GATT nor its ill-fated forerunner, the International Trade Organization, contemplated responsiveness to the producers and workmen of this country and their interests by these governing international bodies. The elimination of this responsiveness, so specifically and elaborately guarded in the Constitution, was arranged through the one-vote mechanism (whereby the United States had the same vote as other countries in the international bodies), and through the complete domination of the field by the Executive.

It was on these grounds that I concluded that we should withdraw from GATT and thus bring the regulation of our foreign commerce back to this country, where it belongs, if the people of this country are to continue to exercise control over the acts of their Government.

Thank you for this opportunity to make a reply to the State Department's letter of comment on my attack on GATT.

Sincerely yours,

O. R. STRACKBEIN.

State's Witnesses Fight for Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1952

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in our RECORD two articles written in Los Angeles by Mrs. Lorania K. Francis, an outstanding Washington correspondent of the Los Angeles Times. The articles describe hearings before the special master in the case of United States against California. Although California is the only State presenting testimony, other States, and particularly other maritime States, will be directly affected by the decisions resulting from the hearings. The court is endeavoring through the master to obtain a recommendation relative to the criteria to be used in fixing the seaward limits of inland waters. The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 25, 1952]

STATE'S WITNESSES FIGHT FOR TIDELANDS—UNITED STATES' EFFORTS THREATEN ECONOMY, EXPERTS ON INLAND WATERS TESTIFY

(By Lorania K. Francis)

A parade of witnesses familiar with the sheltered waters of Southern California—port managers, harbor engineers, pilots, and sea captains—yesterday appeared before Special Master William H. Davis in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals to bolster California's contention that its inland waters extend to the outer edge of its seaward islands and that the Federal Government's efforts to narrow the area are a threat to the economy of the State.

At the start of local hearings before the New York patent attorney, who was appointed by the Supreme Court to study the *State* v. *United States* dispute over the boundary line which must be drawn to separate the State's inland waters from the marginal sea area claimed by the United States, California seemingly made headway in proving its point that the so-called overall unit area between the Channel Islands and the mainland traditionally has been considered inland waters and a prized haven for ships.

LINE ENCLOSES AREA

The area enclosed by a line drawn from Point Conception to Point Loma and extending around the islands was chosen by Assistant Attorney General Everett W. Mattoon for the presentation of California's case.

Over occasional objections from Robert M. Vaughan, special assistant to United States Attorney General McGrath, State witnesses testified to the investment represented in the port and harbor facilities of Long Beach and Los Angeles and the harm that is being done the plans for further development of the outer harbor of San Pedro Bay because of uncertainty as to whether the State or the Federal Government will have jurisdiction over the property.

JEOPARDY CLAIMED

"Neither the State nor the government nor the master knows who owns the property," Davis observed, after sustaining an objection by Vaughan to the testimony of E. C. Earle, Los Angeles harbor commissioner who is responsible for the development of the projected harbor facilities.

Earle had stated that a line drawn by the Justice Department, which cuts across San Pedro Bay well within the Federal breakwater, jeopardizes both the future development of the harbor and the anchorages between the breakwater and the shoreward line.

"As the proposed Government line is drawn, practically all the anchorage used by vessels entering Los Angeles would be unavailable if that line remains," he told Davis.

The Port of Los Angeles contemplates expenditures amounting to "many millions of dollars," Earle said, but would not want to spend the money if it appeared the outer area was going to be under Federal jurisdiction.

Earlier in the day, Eloi J. Amar, general manager of the Long Beach Harbor Department, told of the $30,000,000 to $40,000,000 spent in the last 12 years on filling in land and constructing harbor facilities and of a 1700 percent increase in business which the harbor has experienced during that period.

USED BY NAVY

He complained that an area of 20 square miles, between the proposed Government line and the Federal breakwater, is involved in the Justice Department's claim that they are marginal waters and subject to United States' jurisdiction under the Supreme Court's decision that California no longer owns its submerged lands. This area, Amar pointed out, has for its first purpose the anchorage of from 150 to 200 naval vessels, as well as commercial ships which visit the port.

When Mattoon tried to introduce in evidence a United States Coast and Geodetic Survey map showing the anchorages of the ships, Vaughan insisted that permission of the Navy Department should be received before the map was used. Davis agreed he didn't "think we ought to get tangled up with these restricted documents." He suggested, however, that Mattoon's statement regarding the anchorages should be accepted and the map laid aside.

Navy craft cannot enter the inner harbor marked off by the Justice Department's line as California's inland waters, Capt. J. A. Jacobson, chief pilot and marine surveyor for Long Beach Harbor, told the special master.

The veteran pilot testified as to how the harbor pilots pick up vessels several miles out in the Pacific and bring them into anchorage.

Battleships, aircraft carriers, and ships carrying explosives have anchorages outside the Government's stipulated line, he testified. Quarantine vessels also are anchored within the breakwater but outside the line.

SAFETY DESCRIBED

The development of Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors by public-minded citizens of the two areas was described by Robert R. Shoemaker, civil construction engineer and harbor engineer since 1940. Through a committee of 200, which had gone into its own pockets with each member contributing approximately $1,000, plans were developed as early as 1923, Shoemaker said, and the extension of the Long Beach breakwater was undertaken.

All but about 5 percent of the contemplated improvements are now in the outer harbor, he testified, with about 95 percent located in the strip between the Government line and the breakwater.

The safety of the waters lying shoreward of the Channel Islands was testified to by Grant M. Olewiler, beach engineer for the city of Los Angeles, and experienced towboat captains and salvage men. According to Olewiler a wind recorder located on a pier at Venice showed over a 55-month period, between 1938 and 1943, that winds of a velocity of more than 25 miles an hour occurred on only 38 days during the period. The strongest wind recorded reached 38 miles an hour, he said.

Ernie Judd, president of the Pacific Towboat and Salvage Co. and owner of a water-taxi service, substantiated Olewiler's testimony with a statement that winds can reach 60 miles an hour outside the island chain and not be more than 15 miles an hour within the area.

WATER SELDOM ROUGH

Geoffrey Hoag, manager of Judd's company, said that the waters inside the island chain never become so rough that ships cannot operate. He said there is a "natural lee" all the way from Point Conception to Point Loma and that the water is so calm in that area that 99 percent of all gasoline and oil used in San Diego can be barged in in small boats instead of being moved by tanker.

Further evidence as to the inland waters nature of the area was given by Perry Brubacker, marine superintendent for the Luckenbach Steamship Line and former ship's master. Vessels coming in from long trans-Pacific voyages or from the north and south can start preparing for port as soon as they pass the tip of San Clemente Island, he told Davis, and the waters are so sheltered that "many skippers" who are running down the coast from the north Pacific past southern California cut into the area and out again to take advantage of the quiet waters.

The waters of Chesapeake Bay are rougher than those in the lee of Point Conception and the Channel Islands, he said, while Long Island Sound is "much rougher."

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 26, 1952]

TIDELANDS SEIZURE TARGET IN TESTIMONY OF SEAFARERS—SKIPPERS TAKE WITNESS STAND TO AID STATE BATTLE

(By Lorania K. Francis)

Sea captains and boatmen from the southern California area consider the water area lying between the chain of Channel Islands to the mainland to be inland waters—regardless of the attempts of the Department of Justice to restrict the jurisdiction of the State of California to a much smaller area close to shore.

This was made clear yesterday at the opening of the second session of the so-called tidelands hearings before Special Master William H. Davis in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the Federal Building here.

AUTHORITIES ON STAND

Six pilots and sea captains, a small-boat constructor from Long Beach and a marine engineer and yachtsman with international experience told their experiences with seasick passengers and wrecked vessels in the stormy waters outside the protective barrier formed by Point Conception on the north and the westward islands. The area landward from the islands, however, is so sheltered that plywood rowboats with outboard motors can safely operate from the mainland to the 14-mile bank—a famous swordfish and albacore fishing ground off Santa Catalina Island—they testified.

The outlying islands form a protective barrier from heavy weather outside and shelter can be obtained all along the island chain, Capt. William H. Leisk, master mariner from San Pedro and long-time steamer captain between Los Angeles and Santa Catalina, told Davis.

SKIPPER'S TESTIMONY

Testifying from his experience before he settled in California, Leisk said that Long Island (N. Y.) Sound, an area conceded to be definitely inland water, carries three times the hazard that the so-called over-all unit area within California's island chain presents. A "very much greater sea is to be found on the windward side of Santa Catalina and the other southern California islands," he said.

Fishermen of Southern California consider the inside area inland waters, according to Capt. G. P. Ellington, port captain at Terminal Island for 20 years and manager of the Van Camp Seafood Co. A former master of his own tuna clipper, Ellington said his company operates under contract from 1,200 to 1,500 fishing boats, of which 150 are large tuna clippers.

FISHERMAN'S VIEW

"We fishermen feel that when we pass the islands going to the westward we are going into the open sea," he said.

Similar testimony was given by three Los Angeles Harbor pilots—Capt. Henry P. Timmers, onetime navigating officer on the *City of Los Angeles*, operating between Los Angeles and Honolulu; Capt. Jens O. Holland, former tugboat captain, and Capt. Gudmund Grimstad who, after years of experience in the South Seas and elsewhere, was for 18 years a captain on various yachts in the island area of southern California.

All testified to the "green water" that is found when ships leave the protection of the islands.

EXPERIENCE RELATED

Capt. Lyle Hillsinger, senior pilot at Los Angeles, told of his experience as a captain on steamers running between Los Angeles and San Francisco when the "passengers would come to life" on entering the island area on the southward run and take to their cabins when the ships left the calm waters for the open sea.

Justice Department attorneys, headed by Robert M. Vaughan, special assistant to United States Attorney General McGrath, objected to California's introduction of photographs showing the small boats that can operate safely among the islands on grounds they were not relevant to the discussion. Their objections were overruled, however, by Davis, who said that he could see the point the State was trying to make.

SUPREME COURT RULING ASSAILED BY CONNALLY

WASHINGTON, March 25.—Senator CONNALLY (Democrat, Texas), told the Senate today the Supreme Court committed an unpardonable judicial outrage in ruling the States do not own the submerged lands off their shores.

CONNALLY led off as the Senate resumed its debate on whether the States or the Federal Government should control the oil-rich areas.

The Texan is sponsoring an amendment to pending Federal-control legislation which would give the States ownership of the lands in controversy. The amendment is identical to a bill passed by the House last year.

"We simply want restitution of what is justly ours," he asserted.

The Supreme Court ruled in a California case, and later in Louisiana and Texas cases, that the Federal Government has paramount rights in the offshore areas.

The Constitution, CONNALLY shouted, states that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

"Yet," he said, "the Supreme Court held these lands could be taken without any compensation whatsoever."

his citizenship entails. He must be an active citizen, interesting himself in local, State, and national government, voting wisely, thinking, speaking, and acting to preserve and strengthen freedom, equality, and opportunity for each individual. Freedom for individuals carries with it an equal responsibility to use that freedom wisely. Therefore, if we wish to remain free, we must faithfully fulfill our responsibilities as free men. The average citizen cannot be expected to solve all the problems of the intricate art of government, but he should study and determine the general principles of government. The right to vote is the individual's most potent weapon in the protection of his rights and freedoms. To be effective such a weapon must be constantly and wisely used with party affiliations disregarded in some instances. The United States must consist of an alert, active, and intelligent mass of citizens.

The American public, always quick to criticize its political leaders, often pictures politicians as either entirely good or bad. The shifty and weak will often receive praise simply because of their conforming to the whims of the people, while the one heroically trying for the right will receive only abuse. While criticism is important, it is one of the first duties of the citizen to be just to the officers of his Government. The good opinion of citizens is one of the highest prizes for which a public officer may hope. The citizen should be discriminate in bestowing praise or censure, not only because it is his duty to judge all men fairly, but because it will be an incentive toward right conduct and good government. Also he must learn to weigh facts and use his judgment as to what is right.

Most of us have confidence in ourselves and our country. We do not claim perfection, but we have faith in our ability to move forward, to improve, and to grow. However, self-satisfaction can do much to endanger a democracy as proven by the fall of Athens and others of the great civilizations that existed years ago. A certain feeling of optimism or faith as to the condition of the country must be maintained, but not without facing reality. When a people reach this state they are unwilling to accept changes and their culture is apt to become stagnant or even decay. We must see that nothing obstructs the progress of the American ideals.

If we understand and guide our lives by the principles upon which America was founded, we will be helping to make not only our country, but the world as well a better place in which to live. Because man's horizons have expanded, what happens in the world affects him, and his actions affect the world. Each man has a responsibility to act, and to encourage his country to act, so that freedom and cooperation will be encouraged among the people and nations of the world.

The following excerpt from a poem by Margaret Fromme well illustrates the goal which should be in the heart of every American:

"Our task is not to build the highest building;
The longest bridge; the finest road;
The most modern house; but to build a world
Where everyone has the highest ideals,
The fullest life, the education to fit them for the best way of living;
And where every house is a home."

Our standard of living and the ideals upon which our form of government is based are similar to those for which the peoples of the world have strived since the beginning of history. The American people possess the material and cultural advantages men have dreamed of for thousands of years. It is our duty, the business of every American to appreciate, protect, and enrich the heritage that is ours.

Title to Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 12, 1952

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter regarding the title to tidelands, written by Mr. Amon G. Carter, publisher of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, and published in the New York Times on May 4, 1952.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE TO TIDELANDS—RIGHT OF STATES TO OFFSHORE OIL DEPOSITS IS SUPPORTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

For the competence and thoroughness of its news coverage and for the usual soundness of its editorial opinions I hold the New York Times in high respect. I am sure, however, that the Times would be the last to claim that its judgment is infallible, and in the light of its recent editorial calling for Presidential veto of the so-called tidelands legislation I believe any such claim would be difficult to sustain.

As a Texan who, like most Texans, has a deep interest and feeling in the matter I am distressed at the editorial writer's apparent unfamiliarity with some of the basic facts in the case and his evident failure to recognize the significant implications of it.

There is also a slight feeling of resentment at the suggestion that Congress, in passing legislation to confirm the title of the States to the offshore lands, is attempting to hand over or give away to the States a valuable national asset. Valuable these submerged lands unqestionably are, although insofar as oil production is concerned the value up to now has been more potential than actual. But the oil deposits they contain would be nonetheless a valuable national asset in the hands of the States which were their undisputed owners for more than a hundred years.

DECISIONS ON OWNERSHIP

This ownership was recognized by all branches of the Government, and in an unbroken series of United States Supreme Court decisions from 1842 to 1947, as being unqualified. Even the Supreme Court decisions in the California case in 1947 and the Texas and Louisiana cases in 1950 did not settle the title question with finality, though enunciating a new doctrine of paramount rights which the Court said entitled the Federal Government to possession and use of the lands involved. In the California case the court acknowledged the right of Congress to dispose of the title question by legislation.

Both Houses have passed legislation affirming State ownership of these properties, thus acting in a field of public policy where Congress has a clear right to act. In this there is no element of give-away. It is not a handing over of anything which the Government ever has owned, or of which it even has enjoyed possession and use. It is no donation to the States, but only a recognition of the ownership that concededly was theirs until the submerged lands litigation was instituted.

With special force does this apply in the case of Texas. The Supreme Court, in its 1950 decision, acknowledged that Texas owned its offshore lands outright when it was an independent republic. It acknowledged that the United States solemnly agreed that Texas, in voluntarily becoming a part of the Union, should retain ownership of all its public domain—and also its public debt, which the United States otherwise would have had to assume. Yet the court's decision had the effect of saying that the contract thus entered into in good faith was not binding upon the United States.

ANNEXATION AGREEMENT

Although your editorial writer shows no awareness of it, the fact that this good-faith agreement was summarily brushed aside by the Supreme Court was not lost upon your distinguished Washington correspondent, Arthur Krock. Soon after the decision in the Texas case Mr. Krock wrote from Washington (June 8) that the Supreme Court majority had repealed those terms of the 1845 annexation agreement between two sovereigns—the United States and Texas. The four justices who constituted the majority participating in the case disposed of the agreement, Mr. Krock continued, merely by saying that the fact of annexation obliterated it.

Mr. Krock seemed to have a far clearer conception of some of the other far-reaching implications of the tidelands decisions than is revealed in your most recent editorial on the subject—implications which present a danger to State and private ownership of property in the United States. "If these national needs (of defense and foreign affairs)," he wrote, "should one day be urged as the reason why Minnesota, for example, has illegally exercised ownership of the iron ranges around Lake Superior, the tidelands decisions leave open the way to a finding in that direction."

And further: "If the 'paramount' rights of the Federal Government over the tidelands are in part established by the necessity that these are required 'in the interest * * * of the security of its people from wars waged on or too near its coasts,' then they are established for the same reason anywhere in any State an attack can be delivered by air. And that means almost everywhere."

RESUMPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

The central issue, as you correctly state, is whether the Federal Government or the States will control the private exploitation of one of the Nation's most important (or at least potentially most important) strategic and economic resources. And the issue urgently needs to be settled. The orderly development of offshore oil production needs to be resumed. The development which proceeded for years under State ownership has been brought to a standstill by the cloud of uncertainty now hanging over the tidelands.

The existing stalemate is due to two things: Impairment of the States' title to the submerged lands by the litigation brought by the Federal Government, and the fact that the Federal Government must have permissive legislation from Congress before it can take over and administer the offshore areas. Such permission Congress, by twice passing legislation in favor of the States, has shown itself unwilling to give.

The tidelands are one of the principal potential sources of that oil. They can be made an actual source, a real asset to national security, only by extensive, time-consuming exploration and development in advance of any emergency.

The States have the machinery for that development, set up and operating. They have experience in administering such development. And oil discovered and produced

under State control would be no less available to the Nation in time of emergency than are all other resources of material and production within its borders.

Thus there is imperative necessity for ending the deadlock and making it possible for orderly development of the oil potentialities of the tidelands to proceed. My own interest in this matter is only that of a Texan and an American, and between the two interests I can see no conflict.

AMON G. CARTER.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *April 29, 1952.*

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12, 1952

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address to the people of Pennsylvania which I delivered last Saturday evening, and which is program No. 59 in the series entitled "Happenings in Washington."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—PROGRAM *No. 59*

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

In beginning this broadcast I want to recall an incident in American history which has a direct bearing on recent developments in our Government.

It occurred in our own city of Philadelphia in September 1787. The Constitutional Convention had finished its long and difficult labors after 4 months of debate and discussion.

It is related that when Benjamin Franklin stepped out into State House Square, he was approached by a woman, who asked:

"What kind of government have you given us?"

Dr. Franklin, the wisest and greatest of all Pennsylvania statesmen, replied:

"A republic, if you can keep it."

Since that day there have been many times of grave crisis in the life of our Republic.

There have been times when the American people have been called upon to pay a great price in blood and treasure to keep their Republic.

In our own time we have fought two world wars in defense of the sacred freedoms that are the foundation of our greatness as a Nation.

We have been through times of financial depression. We have battled against drought and floods.

We have resisted the rising tide of communism in many parts of the world.

We are building our defensive strength to meet the danger of further Communist aggression.

But, my fellow Pennsylvanians, none of these threats to the future of the American Republic has been more grave or more ominous than the basic issue growing out of the recent seizure of the Nation's steel industry by the President.

Upon the outcome of that issue depends the kind of government we are to have in the years ahead.

We have reached a cross-road in our history. Now, more than ever before, we can recognize Benjamin Franklin's reply as the voice of prophecy.

We, in these United States, will have a republic only so long as we can keep it. Our plan of government will survive only so long as we are faithful to the ideals of those who established it.

It is not my purpose in this talk to discuss the controversy in the steel industry in terms of wages, prices, or profits.

The leaders of the steel workers' organization and the heads of industry have each presented their side of the dispute to the public through the press and the radio.

No one should question the right of labor to bargain collectively or to strike for a higher wage scale and other favorable conditions of employment.

No one should question the right of the steel stockholders to a fair return on their investment.

But we do have every right to question any attempt by the President, or anyone else, to impose upon this Nation a government that does not derive its powers from the Constitution or from laws enacted by Congress.

We have every right to question any attempt to obstruct or deny the authority of our courts to protect the people against injustice, whether by the President or anyone else.

I want to confine this talk to the fundamental issue involved in the President's order. And that is whether or not we are to continue under the form of government contemplated by the founders of our Republic when they framed the Constitution of the United States.

In other words, whether or not we are to preserve and safeguard the system which has protected the freedom of the individual and has given us the greatest material, cultural, and spiritual achievement the world has ever known.

The great question before us today is whether the three branches of our Government, legislative, executive, and judicial, shall each operate within the broad, clearly defined channels of authority set forth in the Constitution, or whether the executive branch of our Government may break loose with the violence of a Mississippi or a Missouri River on a rampage, flooding away the rights of the other two, the rights of the sovereign States and the rights of all our people, just as these rampaging rivers have swept destructively over farm and city in recent weeks.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, I hope you will listen to this and listen most carefully. It affects every man, woman, and child in the United States.

What I am saying affects your personal freedom, your right to own property, your freedom of speech and worship, your right to work at the job of your choice, your right to join a labor union, and all other rights guaranteed to you under our Constitution and the laws of our land.

The United States will never face a more vital issue, short of invasion by a foreign power.

What has happened does not frighten our citizens as would the dropping of enemy bombs. Yet the damage to freedom of the individual can be much more devastating.

Unfortunately we have been conditioned to the invasion of our rights by 20 years of expanding and concentrating power in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

For 20 years we have lived in an atmosphere of creeping socialism. Now we have taken a great, bounding leap toward all-out dictatorship.

When President Truman seized the steel mills under what he called "the power vested in me by the Constitution" the owners of the various businesses involved took the Government into court in Washington. They challenged the President's authority to take possession of private property without due process of law.

Mr. Holmes Baldridge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, went before Federal Judge David A. Pine to argue the administration's case.

Now, I urge that you listen most carefully to some of the things Mr. Baldridge told the court. Such statements had never been made before in an American court. The Assistant Attorney General of the United States said:

"It is our position that the President is accountable only to the country and that the decisions of the President are conclusive.

"We say that it is prohibited for the courts to encroach upon the Executive authority in a situation such as we have here."

That is the end of the quotation. Think it over.

The President, by Executive directive, had seized certain properties owned by thousands and thousands of stockholders, large and small, without the approval of Congress and without authority under any law.

The administration insisted it was done under inherent powers of the Executive. It was argued that the owners of the property are powerless to go into court and seek an injunction to get their property back.

Now let me read to you again from the argument in court.

Mr. Baldridge stated that the Constitution vested all executive power in the President and added:

"Insofar as legislative powers are concerned, the Congress has only those powers that are specifically delegated to it."

Judge Pine asked and again I quote: "So when the sovereign people gave the powers enumerated in the Constitution, it limited Congress, it limited the judiciary, but it did not limit the Executive?"

To this, Mr. Baldridge replied: "That is the way we read article II of the Constitution."

My fellow Pennsylvanians, for what I believe to be the first time in the history of the United States, the Department of Justice, on behalf of the administration, declared bluntly that there is no limit on the powers of the President.

Do you believe that? Do you believe such a thing is good for our country? Do you believe it is American?

The only countries in which there is no limit upon the powers of the Executive are dictatorships. There was no limit on the power of Hitler in Germany. There is no limit today upon the power of Stalin.

Is the United States heading in the same direction?

Are we being pushed into the dictatorship of a President whose power to act is unlimited?

Do you remember how Stalin once sneered: "How many divisions does the Pope have?"

Do you want an all-powerful dictator in this country who can sneer, "How many divisions does the Supreme Court have?"

This is a new and terribly dangerous departure in our Government. It is an extension of the power which the executive branch has been taking from the States and the people for 20 years.

As recently as the spring of 1950, the President and his Administration didn't dare to claim such broad inherent powers.

At that time a coal strike was threatened and the President appeared before Congress asking for specific authority to seize the Nation's coal mines.

Now, the President's action in seizing the steel plants, if permitted to stand, would put him above the law. He takes the position that he can seize the steel mills, the coal mines, or anything else without any grant of authority from the representatives of the people, the Congress of the United States, if he, alone, decides it is in the public interest.

political whims and designs of an administration grasping for more power over the people. * * *

"The history of the nations which have adopted compulsory military training has not been too flattering. They have gone down to defeat and oblivion, but some of the military would have us ignore history in this respect. I prefer the machinery for furnishing men for the defense of this country under a system that is close to the people and under a system that certainly cannot be said to be a failure. * * * I shall work and vote to protect the great mass of the citizens of this country in having something to say about the conditions, and under whose behest hundreds of thousands and possibly millions of the flower of our youth shall be thrown around the world, and I shall vote against UMT because I am not going to depart from an American tradition that is more compelling to me than the whims and desires of the big brass who would regiment this Nation on a road of destruction."

To which we can only add "Amen."

Kansas, along with other freedom-loving citizens of America, can be justly proud of Senator ANDY SCHOEPPEL and his consistent record of voting to keep the Government in the hands of the people.

So long as men of his caliber remain in Congress the flaming hopes of our forefathers have an excellent chance of becoming a reality.

The Tidelands Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1952

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on April 1, during the Senate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, dealing with the so-called tidelands question, I was pleased to point out to the Senate at pages 3244 to 3247 of the RECORD, that the fundamental question involved was one of States' rights. I inserted in the RECORD an analysis of the various law review articles written on the tidelands cases, demonstrating that the majority of considered legal opinion is that the tidelands decisions changed the previously understood law as to legal ownership of the offshore lands. It was also noted during the debate on that bill that the oil companies were not concerned as to whether ownership was in the Federal or State Government, as these companies would get the drilling contracts in either event.

The American Bar Association has again expressed its views on the tidelands issue. In its most recent resolution, it indicated that both right and law justified the recent action of Congress in voting the quitclaim bill. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas since the formation of the Union the States have claimed and exercised dominion and control over the lands under their navigable waters, both inland and offshore, upon the coasts, and such titles of the States have been recognized and upheld by the courts and by the executive departments of the Government for 150 years; and

Whereas in the recent tidelands cases *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19 (1947)), *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699 (1950)), and *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950)), in which the Federal Government sued the States for title to or paramount rights in and powers over the lands and other resources underlying such land and for injunction against trespass in the marginal belt along its coast, the Supreme Court, without adjudicating title to such lands in the Government, held that in the absence of "congressional surrender of title or interest" and because of the paramount rights the Government has to defend and protect such property, it has also the "full dominion" over such lands and "full dominion over the resources of the soil"; and

Whereas we feel that the Government's recognized paramount interest in such marginal belt lands, as well as in the lands under navigable inland waters, may be exercised completely without the necessity of depriving the respective States of ownership rights, so long recognized; and

Whereas the new concept that the Federal Government has the paramount right to take property without compensation because it may need that property in discharging its duty to defend the country and conduct its foreign relations can have no logical end except that the Federal Government may take over all property, public and private, and under this theory the Federal Government could nationalize all of the natural resources of the country without paying the owners therefor, wholly in disregard of the fifth amendment; and

Whereas it has been the sense of the American Bar Association since 1945, as expressly set out in 1945 and in 1948 by the resolutions adopted by this association, and by reports of its various committees and special committees, that legislation confirming ownership by the States of these lands should be enacted into the law of the land; and

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives recently have passed the so-called tidelands bill, Senate Joint Resolution 20 (the Holland bill), by a substantial majority in both Houses of the Congress: Now, therefore, in harmony with the continuous policy of the American Bar Association since 1945: Be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association urges the National Congress to take immediate action to confirm to the respective States their historic ownership of these submerged lands by enacting into law the so-called tidelands bill, Senate Joint Resolution 20, and in the event of a Presidential veto that same be passed over a Presidential veto.

Comments on the Immigration Bill by the Detroit News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BLAIR MOODY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1952

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not Yet Perfected," published in the Detroit News of Saturday, May 10, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT YET PERFECTED

The McCarran immigration bill, whose defeat in the Senate has been asked by Detroit nationality and church groups, is the product of 3 years of hearing and debate.

It is a codification of existing laws and regulations, which during 30 years of the policy of restricted immigration have grown to be an all but incomprehensible maze.

Codification was an obvious necessity. Yet, despite the time and effort expended, it is still the view of many, like the Detroit groups mentioned, that the net result is bad.

The bill takes utterly no account of the changes in national population problems that have occurred since the formula first was enacted of basing immigration quotas on our 1920 census of national origins.

It extends quotas to Asiatic and Pacific island races formerly excluded, which is a laudable concession to the principle of racial equality. However, these concessions are made at the expense of existing quotas, with the net effect of actually curtailing future immigration from troubled Europe.

In other respects the bill rather consistently errs on the side of harshness.

It is hard to defend such provisions as those providing in many cases for arbitrary deportations without opportunity for judicial or even administrative review.

The general tone and character of the legislation is further indicated by its deportation of aliens who after immigration become victims of mental disease or are otherwise incapacitated. In their administration such provisions are clearly capable of inexcusable cruelty.

In over-all effect the bill is crabbedly nationalistic, ill conforming with American pretentions of sympathy for other peoples, victims of totalitarian oppression.

Despite the consideration already given it, its 165 printed pages plainly need more attention, for which purpose the Senate should send it back to committee.

Miss Geneva Harrison, Teacher of Blind Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1952

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the most heartening stories that has come to my attention recently is that of the blind Howard University coed who for 7 months has been the recipient of volunteer extracurricular reading by professors and students of the university to help her to attain her degree.

According to the story in the Washington Post, the coed, Miss Geneva Harrison, of Miami, Fla., plans to return to the Florida city as a teacher of blind children when she has completed her course in Washington.

When she appealed last fall to professors for volunteer readers to aid her study of her various textbooks, both students and professors offered their services and extraordinary efforts were put forth by many among her costudents to give her help in all phases of her campus life and studies.

It is a story that contrasts so completely with ideologies that prevail in other sections of the world, and refutes so thoroughly the many slanders circulated by our Communist enemies regarding conditions in the United States,

Veto Message on the Tidelands Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1952

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a taxpayer of this community, Miss E. A. Kendall, has some very interesting comments to make about the President's veto message on the so-called tidelands oil measure. I hereby insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of Congress who are interested in the matter:

The theme of the veto message on the so-called tidelands measure is that the whole Nation will lose valuable resources and revenue if the individual States retain rights to underwater resources. This whole argument amazes me as a taxpayer for the simple reason that the whole Nation stands to lose far more extensive and probably richer resources and revenues in another way and very few persons in the Government are giving heed to this point at all.

The veto message refutes itself, as it were, when full light is thrown upon Federal indifference to Antarctic resources that should belong to the United States citizens. It is clearly against the national interest to maintain apathy in regard to Antarctic resources and possibilities; yet instead of looking after this, the Federal Government would reach into the pockets of the States and seize resources from them. That is not only highly irregular, it is quite unnecessary.

The tidelands measure was vetoed because it makes a free gift of immensely valuable resources, which belong to the entire Nation, to the States which happen to be located nearest to them. However, as far as this citizen knows, there was no United States official protest when on May 22 and 23 this year Peron in Argentina said that Argentina and Chile are the only countries having rights in Antarctica, his contention presumably being on the basis of contiguity or being located nearest to them—that is, nearest to the riches of the Antarctic. Why does the Federal Government, the administration, think location of resources does not relate to possession in the one case and make no protest in the other case? Both are of importance to the United States taxpayer's pocketbook.

Again, the Canadian Almanac and Directory, 1950, says the main portion of Antarctica is under the authority of the Commonwealth of Australia. Yet, while Australia is closer to Antarctica than the United States and can base some claim on that point, why does the administration not protest that that is no reason for Australian claims to Antarctic resources, if the administration believes nearness to the resources in North America on the part of certain States is no reason for possession?

(The above points are not meant to promote Argentina or any other claims, but merely to spotlight the old argument in the veto message.)

Maybe the United States refrains from claiming her rightful Antarctic resources because she is distant, yet it is held that her own States shall not claim their offshore resources because they are located nearest to them. There is something all wrong with the thinking here. There seems to be a turning in upon itself of a great Nation, rather than an expanding, a natural growth, a courageous development of new resources available to it under its own rightful heritage through the work of its own explorers. There are vast new frontiers. It is not necessary to feel a sense of bondage or limitation. It is not necessary to resort to an unnatural twisting of facts and traditions to secure new resources and revenues.

"Robbery in broad daylight" and on a supercolossal scale is perpetuated by the administration when Antarctic lands rightfully belonging to the United States citizens are not protected for these citizens, but rather are tentatively offered to the United Nations or to a condominium administration (see State Department press release No. 689 of August 28, 1948).

Moreover, we have before us during the same week as the veto, the Bonn peace treaty with Germany. Our Nation has given lives and money to humble an aggressor twice in a generation, yet when an agreement which is to all intents and purposes the peace treaty is signed with the only responsible political body of that conquered country, the United States permits said country to retain rights to a great tract of Antarctic territory upon which the flags and emblems of the conquered nation rest today, so that with returning sovereignty the conquered nation has full permission apparently to pursue her Antarctic interests. (Not having a copy of this deeply hidden text I am relying on the digest available May 26, 1952.) So, with respect to the tidelands veto, it may be asked, How can that veto be based sincerely on a desire for revenues for the United States citizens as a whole when these same citizens see a nation they have twice conquered receive on a silver platter a huge tract potentially rich in resources?—not that that particular tract would otherwise belong to United States citizens, but its disposition and future revenues from it might well be arranged to the advantage of United States citizens in lifting the heavy burden of foreign aid. But, no, that has not been done and the Federal Government persists in reaching for the States' treasures "in the national interest."

The veto message says that the offshore lands are enormously valuable and a priceless national heritage and that there seems "no good reason for the Federal Government to make an outright gift, for the benefit of a few coastal States, of property worth billions of dollars—property interests which belong to 155 million people."

This is substantially the argument that should be used for pressing United States claims to her rightful Antarctic territory. By not doing so, this Nation is making an outright gift to foreign nations of property interests worth billions of dollars which belong to all the people of the United States.

Stewardship is in truth a function of the Federal Government, but the performance needs redirection.

Miss E. A. KENDALL.

Should Let Them Go Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1952

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an editorial as it appeared in the Morning Gazette, Billings, Mont., March 24, 1952. The editorial follows:

SHOULD LET THEM GO AHEAD

Private utility interests are ready and willing to invest $350,000,000 in a hydroelectric plant at Niagara Falls. New York and Federal Government leaders refuse to grant the necessary permission. Those leaders insist that the plant be built with public funds. In one case, whichever government finances the enterprise would receive absolutely nothing in taxes. In the other, several million dollars a year would be paid by the owners of private built plant into a public treasury. The claim made in favor of public ownership is that it would protect the users of electric energy generated by the plant from being robbed by a power monopoly. This despite the fact that utility charges are fixed by public-service agencies of State and Federal Governments. It is just another phase of the unceasing fight between advocates of a socialistic system of government and the proponents of private enterprise.

Korean Sink Hole: There Will Be No Victory in This Political War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1952

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by an outstanding journalist, Mr. John S. Knight, editor of the Chicago Daily News, and which appeared in his paper on May 31. Mr. Knight analyzes the situation clearly and I recommend it to the attention of all Members of this House:

KOREAN WAR DRAGS ON WITHOUT HOPE OF VICTORY

On Friday, most of our 48 States observed Memorial Day, a day set aside to honor the memory of those war veterans who gave their lives that the Nation might live.

In modern times, Memorial Day, or Decoration Day as it is inappropriately called, has become a sports holiday rather than a period of sober reflection.

The true purpose of the day has been engulfed in waves of pleasure and commercialism.

We like to believe that our sons have not died in vain, that their heroism in the wars of the Republic has preserved and strengthened our national heritage.

Still, as we recall such slogans as "making the world safe for democracy" and "saving the free world against communism," the sonorous clichés of our holiday orators resound emptily from a thousand microphones.

Their messages reveal little of the resolute courage for which Americans have long been noted. They tend, instead, to represent a mass apologia for expediency and indecision as exemplified by our faltering and bungling course of action in Korea.

FAR EASTERN POLICY GUIDED BY EXPEDIENCY

The Korean war is nearing its second anniversary.

It has been an epic of death and destruction invited by the failure of our statesmanship and written in the blood of 108,977 American casualties.

The records show that the failure of American policy in the Far East must be attributed to expediency rather than ignorance. The Russian design for world conquest has always included China, Korea, Japan, and India with utilization of their manpower and raw materials.

residential areas. The other four served business districts where the delivery service was not affected by the readjustments of service. The ages of these carriers ranged from 36 to 59 years. The causes of the deaths had no relationship to their occupation.

The article in the weekly magazine contains the statement, "And Donaldson, disagreeing with the Hoover Commission findings, insists that his operation is just about as efficient as his funds permit." This statement, as well as many others occurring in the press, indicate that the Post Office Department has done nothing about the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission. As a matter of fact, I received a letter just the other day in which the writer stated: "What are you doing about the Hoover Commission reforms, particularly with reference to a business-type accounting system?"

There has been a complete absence of facts in the dissemination of information concerning the action taken by the Post Office Department on the Hoover Commission recommendations. The writer just referred to apparently does not know that a new accounting system was put into effect through legislative action in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations on November 15, 1950. Many statements had been made to the effect that if a new modernized accounting system were instituted in the postal service, as much as $250,000,000 a year could be saved. You can well see how ridiculous this statement is in the fact that at no time did our accounting system cost in excess of $25,000,000 a year. How can you substitute for a system that costs less than $25,000,000 a year, a new system which would save $250,000,000 a year?

The report of the so-called Hoover Commission contained nine recommendations. Five of these recommendations have been put into effect through reorganization under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949, one other recommendation is pending before the Congress under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1952, and two which require legislation are pending in the Congress. As a matter of fact, most of the recommendations made by the task force for the Hoover Commission and the Commission itself were in line with suggestions made by officials of the Post Office Department.

Most of the criticism appearing in the press is general and not specific. Some of it does relate to specific instances of delay in the handling of mail. We do not object to constructive criticism and we will try to correct all errors that are called to our attention. However, the public must be mindful that our postal people are human beings and in handling the billions of pieces of mail, some errors will creep in, some pieces of mail will be mishandled. That was true 20 years ago, it was true 15 years ago, it has always been true in the operation of the postal service. The greater the volume, the greater the possibility for a larger number of errors. We may expect to receive a complaint from the mishandling of one letter; yet, at the same time we seldom receive any praise for the correct and prompt handling of millions of pieces of mail daily.

Some of the criticism is made in comparing our postal service with the service of foreign postal administrations. The statement has been made that a letter mailed at the general post office at Paris, France, as late as noon, or 30 minutes after noon, will be delivered anywhere in Paris the same day. They say this is not true in the United States postal service. In making this statement they do not tell you that the letter mailed in Paris must contain postage for special delivery, and neither do they tell you that in our postal service we deliver special delivery mail from 7 a. m. to 11 p. m., and that a letter mailed in a general post office in the United States as late as 8 p. m. will be delivered the same day if the special delivery fee is paid.

Again, it has been stated that the postal service in London, England, is far superior to the postal service in the United States. It might not be amiss to quote verbatim from a statement made by Assistant Postmaster General Gammons of the English postal system before the House in March of 1952 in connection with the bill to provide the money required for operating Great Britain's postal service:

"Many honorable members wonder whether we shall ever again get back the penny post and the prewar midnight collections of letters in London. The answer to both of these is 'No.' The penny post is gone with the prewar purchasing power of the pound. As to midnight collections of letters in London and the very late collections in other districts, they were based upon standards of working on the part of postal officers which I do not believe either side of the House would accept today. * * * To restore deliveries and collections to the prewar scale and still maintain the present-day standards of working would require an additional 10,000 men. It is quite clear that the country could not afford that today."

The United States postal system produces 60 percent as much revenue as the combined revenue of all other postal administrations and the United States postal system handles more pieces of mail than all of the other postal administrations of the world.

Now, let us take a look at the problems encountered in the management of this vast postal service. Our postal service is beset with more paramount problems than at any time in my connection with the service, which extends over more than four decades. They are not insurmountable but some of them are most difficult to solve. The postal business in terms of revenue has doubled in 10 years and quadrupled in 30 years. In fact, since I entered the postal service, the business has increased ten-fold. We do have growing pains. The amount of low revenue producing mail, largely bulk mailings of publications and parcel post, has greatly taxed the facilities of the postal service. There has been no Federal building program since 1939 and there is a woeful lack of space in the postal buildings of all large centers. There is also a shortage of terminal facilities in every large center. During the past 25 years there has been a 65 percent withdrawal of passenger trains which formerly carried mail. This has required the Department to look to other forms of transportation such as the highway post office, short haul of mail, and extension of star route service. Therefore, we have plenty of problems with respect to volume, space, and transportation.

Most of you are familiar with our personnel problems incident to the so-called Whitten rider and regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission whereby we have been prohibited from making permanent appointments in the postal service since December 1, 1950. At the present time we have more than 87,000 temporary employees in the field postal service who, without security, could hardly be expected to develop the required amount of ambition, energy, and application to duty that would be developed under permanent appointments.

We are trying to bring about an exception to the field postal service so that permanent appointments can be made up to the level of authorized positions on September 1, 1950, which would permit the filling of all vacancies in the regular force that existed at that time or that have occurred since that time.

You postmasters must live with these problems day in and day out and I want to express my heartfelt appreciation for the splendid cooperation you have given to the Department and your continued efforts to provide a good postal service in the face of all of these problems.

However much we may do and however great our problems may be, we must not take the attitude that the postal service does not need to be improved or that little or nothing can be done about it.

The public is conscious of the fact whenever they are required to pay more postage but they are not conscious of the fact that through legislative action or action taken by regulatory bodies outside the postal service the cost of operating the service has greatly increased. Therefore, in the face of all of this criticism, we must ever be alert to the things that can be done within the limit of the appropriation to provide a good postal service.

Let me commend each and everyone of you for your loyalty and your application to duty and the good job you are doing under most adverse conditions.

Tidelands Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1952

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 10, 1952:

TIDELANDS VETO

The very title of the so-called tidelands oil bill is a fraud. It purports to be a joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters * * *. But the resolution adopted by Congress, and vetoed a fortnight ago by the President, has nothing to do, in point of fact, with lands within States boundaries. It has nothing whatever to do with inland waters or with tidelands—a term which is properly applied only to the narrow strip of land lying between high tide and low tide. It deals, rather, with land lying seaward of the tidelands, beyond the inland waters and wholly outside State boundaries—the strip between the low-tide mark and the 3-mile limit properly called the marginal sea.

Now, it is impossible for Congress to confirm * * * the titles of the States to these lands for the simple reason that the States, as component parts of the Federal Union, have never had any titles to them. Our authority for this assertion is the Supreme Court of the United States—a body created by the Constitution for the express purpose of settling controversies of this sort. The Supreme Court, although it has held repeatedly that the States do indeed have title to their inland waters, ruled unequivocally in the California case of 1947 that California had no title to the marginal sea and that paramount rights in and full domain over the area rested in the United States as a sovereign nation. Texas enjoyed such rights and dominion during the decade of her independence but relinquished them upon relinquishing her national sovereignty when she joined the United States.

What Congress attempted to do, therefore, in its tidelands resolution was to give away to three coastal States, California, Texas, and Louisiana, lands and mineral resources which belong to the people of the whole American Union. President Truman sent this resolution back to Congress with a forceful and compelling veto message be-

cause, he said, "I do not believe such an action would be in the national interest, and I do not see how any President could fail to oppose it." For our part, we do not see how any Congress acting as a legislature of the United States could fail to sustain a veto on these grounds.

A strange sort of frenzy seems, however, to have taken hold of the officials of a great many interior States of the Union which have nothing to gain and everything to lose from quitclaim legislation. They have allowed themselves to be bamboozled into a belief that somehow or other the Supreme Court's ruling in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases has cast doubt on the status of lands beneath their navigable inland waters. The fear is, of course, an altogether groundless one. Its groundlessness was made abundantly clear by the President when he declared in his veto message, "If the Congress wishes to enact legislation confirming the States in the ownership of what is already theirs—that is, the lands and resources under navigable inland waters and the tidelands—I shall, of course, be glad to approve it. But such legislation is completely unnecessary, and bears no relation whatever to the question of what should be done with lands which the States do not now own—that is, the lands under an open sea."

Apart from the constitutional issues involved, the President pointed out in his veto message the importance of keeping the oil of the marginal sea under Federal management in order to conserve it for national-defense purposes. He pointed out, too, the tremendous benefits that could accrue to the Nation as a whole by devoting the revenue to be derived from exploitation of the marginal sea to a program of Federal aid to education in the manner proposed not long ago by Senator HILL. These ought to be compelling considerations to Members of Congress whose business it is to serve national, not merely local or sectional, interests. The Senate will be tested as a national body when it votes this week on a motion to override the President's veto. We hope that the veto will be sustained.

Three Minutes a Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1952

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. James Keller, from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News:

THREE MINUTES A DAY

(By Rev. James Keller)

When baseball's colorful Frankie Frisch was piloting the Pittsburgh Pirates, he was often the recipient of grandstand advice.

One particular Sunday afternoon Frankie found himself hounded and heckled by a man directly in back of home plate. All afternoon the loud-voiced patron found fault with Frankie's decisions. He denounced his every move and shouted instructions as to how the game should be played.

When it was all over Frisch walked over to the amateur with pencil and paper in hand, and asked him his name and business address.

Proud and flattered, the customer answered Frankie, and then asked why he wanted the information.

"Because," Frankie replied pleasantly, "I'm gonna be at your office bright and early tomorrow morning and tell you how to run your business."

It is easy to sit on the sidelines and complain. But it is far more important to get in the thick of things and correct the evils. No sphere of influence can ever be any better than the people in it—just as no team can be any better than the players. The only way to improve the vital fields of Government, education, labor relations, and communications is to get people with a high sense of purpose to go into them on a career basis.

"Endeavor to be patient in supporting the defects and infirmities of others of what kind soever; because thou also hast many things which others must bear withal." (Imitation of Christ XVI:2).

O Lord, help me to do something more than just find fault.

The Case of the Missing Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1952

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Traveler of Saturday, June 7, 1952:

THE CASE OF THE MISSING CARRIER

Something akin to the weird nonsense of Alice in Wonderland is threatening national security today.

It lies in the fact that the House of Representatives stubbornly refuses to allow the Navy to build aircraft carriers big enough and strong enough to handle modern planes.

No Congressman with half a brain would try to put 4 gallons of gasoline into a 3-gallon container. Nor would he try to launch a Viking rocket from the rear seat of a model T Ford. Nor would he expect the Air Force to carry its 1952 bomb loads in 1940 medium bombers.

Yet none of those things is any more ridiculous than what the House of Representatives has done to the Navy. It has blocked the modern carrier-building program, setting up a situation whereby ships that were designed 12 years ago are supposed to handle the planes being designed today.

They just won't fit, that's all.

The Navy admittedly is bewildered by this attitude. It keeps trying to locate the congressional blind spot, in order to clear up the view. It hasn't had much luck up to now.

Navy Secretary Dan Kimball has tried. Admiral William M. Fechteler, Chief of Naval Operations, has tried. John F. Floberg, Assistant Secretary for Air, has tried. They've discovered they might as well be talking to the cornerstone of the Washington Monument.

Congress apparently was beginning to see the light 1 year ago when it authorized the 60,000-ton carrier *Forrestal*, now under construction. Then its vision grew fuzzy.

Secretary Kimball has said we should have at least four of this *Forrestal* class "under construction right now" and that what we really need is one such carrier each year for the next 10 years.

A second carrier was sought this year when the Navy made a list of its requirements. The Secretary of Defense and the President O. K.'d the funds to build the ship, and it was included in the President's budget. The House Committee on Armed Services unanimously approved the request.

Less than 3 weeks later, however, the admirals were blinking with astonishment. The Appropriations Committee had sliced the carrier out of the budget and the House had passed the defense appropriation bill—without providing for the carrier, of course.

Meanwhile, the Navy had been trying to get the Appropriations Committee to change its mind. The admirals had pleaded that other ships be dropped to equal the cost of the carrier, but, for the "luvva" Pete, to leave the new carrier where it belonged, at the top of the priority list.

The Appropriations Committee had replied by chopping six items from the bottom of the Navy's priority list—and once again knocking the carrier off the top.

That's the way the situation stands today, with the Navy still hoping to get the carrier restored when the Senate takes action on the appropriation.

The big carriers that played their part in World War II belonged to the *Essex* class, designed in 1940. We built 24 of those ships, and we still have them all, 9 with the active fleet and 15 in moth balls.

The *Essex* class has been modernized to some extent, of course. But from here on the 1940 hull cannot be changed enough to handle the 1953 airplanes.

Three *Midway* class carriers, much bigger than the *Essex* class, were built after World War II, but their design dates back to 1943. When modernized, these can handle the planes of today, but they'll be out of date tomorrow.

Action on a program of the *Forrestal* class would give the Navy what it needs for handling modern planes at sea, and would not in any way cost any of the other services a dime.

This is strictly an issue between the Navy and Congress, and has no effect on the progress of other military arms. The Air Force budget and the Army budget would not be altered one way or another, even if the Navy won an okay to put every nickel it gets into *Forrestal* carriers.

Admiral Fechteler summed up the facts at a speech before the Bond Club of New York earlier this spring, when he said:

"Modern carrier aircraft are heavier and larger in size than their predecessors.

"Being jets, they consume more fuel. Their landing speeds are greater. The effectiveness of jet fighters depends upon their being catapulted rather than flown from the flight deck.

"Their bomb load is greater than the older planes. They require a bigger ship to service and operate them.

"There are seven major reasons why we must build these large modern aircraft carriers:

"First, increased weight of aircraft.

"Second, need for increased fuel capacity.

"Third, need for more catapults for launching.

"Fourth, need for more aviation ordnance space.

"Fifth, increased dimensions of modern aircraft.

"Sixth, increase in aircraft landing speeds.

"Seventh, need for better protection against torpedoes, bombs, and other weapons.

"To deny the Navy this type of ship is to deny the Navy the use, in a very few years, of the best plane industry can build for purposes of carrier attack.

"It is as sensible to prohibit the lengthening of runways on shore * * * as it is to deny the Navy a carrier sufficient to handle the planes now available."

The Navy does not claim that the aircraft carrier is the win-all weapon of modern warfare. It doesn't claim this any more than

is only one way to do anything or any job, and that is to do it right and not to lay down on the job until it is completed and it is done right.

Recently, Brig. Gen. Hayden L. Boatner was named commandant of the POW camp on Koje Island. General Boatner was formerly a commandant of the cadet Corps at A. and M. and more recently assistant division commander of the Second Infantry Division in Korea. I visited with him during my recent sojourn on the front lines in Korea, and in my short stay concluded that he was as fine a leader of men in combat as he was at A. and M. in Texas. Today, he is currently carrying out the philosophies of the teachings at A. and M. on Koje Island as is evidenced by the fine editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of June 11 following these remarks:

RIGHT WAY AT KOJE

Army troops under Generals Boatner and Trapnell showed extraordinary finesse in cleaning up the prisoner mess at Koje Island. It is of course a sorry commentary on past inattention to conditions at Koje that an airborne regiment had to be sent in to break up the prisoner compounds into smaller groups. But General Boatner, with a firmness backed by force, has gone a long way toward atoning for the foolishness of Generals Dodd and Carlson.

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about the dispersion is that it was accomplished without firing a single shot. Despite the ambitious plans of the Communists and the variety of crude weapons they had accumulated, they seem to have folded up meekly enough when their leaders were captured. No doubt the Communist propagandists will indulge in an orgy of distortion, particularly in view of the full press and picture coverage of the Koje affair. Nonetheless, we think General Clark was right in recognizing that the public interest called for participation of the press.

The capable handling of the situation ought also to reassure our allies who previously were disturbed by what the Manchester Guardian termed "scandal without representation." Actually, the Canadian protest to the United States about the dispatch of Canadian troops to Koje without prior approval from Ottawa was more than a trifle silly. The request reportedly was cleared with the British Commonwealth commander in Korea who seemingly neglected to inform Ottawa. It would be ridiculous, of course, if a field commander had to seek governmental approval for every tactical disposition of troops. Either Canadian troops are part of a U. N. army or they are not. If they are, then the principle of international command must apply just as it applies to other troops in Korea.

What the Koje affair does illustrate is the need for a rearrangement of behind-the-lines responsibilities. It is too much of a burden on General Van Fleet as a fighting leader to expect him to worry about such things as control of prisoner-of-war camps. In the war in Europe, support operations of this sort were the responsibility of a separate communications zone commander heading up to the supreme commander. In Korea such activities are under Brigadier General Yount—who, despite his reprimand for what happened at Koje, is accounted a fine officer—but General Yount reports to General Van Fleet. The top responsibility has remained with the Eighth Army because of the guerrilla activity in rear areas and the fear until recently that rear areas could again become a battle zone.

Now, however, the situation appears to be sufficiently stabilized to permit the establishment of a separate communications zone, with the commander maintaining close liaison with General Van Fleet, but responsible directly to General Clark in Tokyo. Such a command would relieve General Van Fleet of the job of supervising many functions not directly connected with the fighting. It also should help assure the kind of supervision that would avoid a repetition of the fiasco at Koje.

Veterans' Administration Should Change Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1952

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, many home-seeking veterans and builders have complained to me about the recent ruling of the Veterans' Administration which instructed its field officers not to act upon loans for veterans' homes located within 4 miles of any airport. The Veterans' Administration has requested that all applications for homes to be built closer to airports than 4 miles be sent to Washington for final approval or rejection. A spokesman for the VA has stated that this action came about following a series of crashes in New Jersey.

It is a well-known fact that the airports in Oklahoma are not crowded and in congested residential areas as they are in New Jersey. I flew back from Oklahoma today not only to vote for the abolition of regulation X but also to urge that the Veterans' Administration remove this ban on building within a 4-mile limit of airports as it applies to the State of Oklahoma.

In Most Places We Honor Our Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1952

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present herewith a column by Arnold Burnett in the Peoria Journal, of Peoria, Ill.:

IN MOST PLACES WE HONOR OUR WAR DEAD
(By Arnold Burnett)

Memorial Day, and in all parts of the world, as well as here at home, Americans will pause to pay tribute to those who gave their lives for their country on the battlefields of the world.

In national cemeteries throughout this Nation, from big Arlington, across the river from Washington, where 73,166 are buried, to the tiny Custer battlefield cemetery, where 265 lie at rest near the Little Big Horn in Wyoming, graves will be visited and decorated.

Atop a green hill in the quiet countryside at Maddingley, near Cambridge, England, 3,800 Americans sleep—Americans who helped defend Britain in those dark days of World War II; who died in the air raids; whose planes crashed on the English countryside.

Gleaming white marble crosses mark these graves, and 468 other graves of Americans in a little cemetery at Brookwood, England.

In North Africa, at Tunis, and ancient Carthage, 2,830 Americans rest, after giving their lives fighting the enemy in the bloody battles of the Kasserine Pass and El Alamein.

Anzio Beach, Italy, was drenched with the blood of the brave Americans who fell there. There are 7,859 of them resting in a cemetery beside the beach—4,500 more of them in a cemetery outside Florence. White marble crosses trace gently curving rows where they lie. Among them are 12 American girls, WAC's who also died in the service of their country.

And in France thousands more of our boys and men rest in cemeteries in many parts of that nation, resting in honored glory beside their buddies and their allies.

And their resting places are marked with marble crosses which gleam softly over their graves—over the graves of more than 100,000 Americans who will never come home; who rest eternally thousands of miles from the land for whose liberty they died.

In the Punchbowl Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii, 14,000 Americans are buried; those who were killed while fighting their way ashore on the many bloody islands of the Pacific during World War II.

From all parts of America they came; from Kansas and Illinois, from Florida and Massachusetts, from Alaska and Hawaii and Idaho and the Virgin Islands. And now they lie peacefully in the Punchbowl on Hawaii's "hill of sacrifice," overlooking the blue Pacific, with Honolulu on one side of them and Pearl Harbor on the other.

No crosses here. No white marble crosses for the Christians, no white marble stars of David for the Jews. There were white wooden crosses there last Memorial Day, but these are gone now. Rooted up by the Army. Too expensive to maintain, the Army explained. Economy, says the Army.

So on this flat plain, with no monuments except the flat grave markers, with no memorials, no symbols of their faith, sleep 14,000 Americans in the soft beauty of Hawaii.

The people of Hawaii are putting 50,000 flower leis on the graves today. Sweet-scented circlets of ginger blooms, orchids and jasmine and hibiscus and the many, many lovely flowers that grow in profusion in Hawaii.

Last Memorial Day the 50,000 lilies were draped gently and lovingly on the gleaming white crosses. Today they are lying flat on the flat graves in the Punchbowl.

Gleaming white marble crosses for American war dead all over the world, but not even wooden crosses for those in the Punchbowl. Too expensive, says the Army. Economy, says the Army.

Correspondence Between Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, and Secretary Chapman With Relation To Leasing of Oil and Gas Deposits in the Continental Shelf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 12, 1952

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Secretary

of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, which makes it clear that no effort will be made to use the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act for the leasing of oil and gas deposits in the Continental Shelf. The Secretary advises me that he has recommended to the President that no further consideration be given to this possibility and that the President has concurred in this judgment. This means that the Executive order of September 28, 1945, by which the President committed the submerged area to the custody of the Department of the Interior pending legislative action by the Congress will not be changed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Secretary Chapman's letter to me of June 11, as well as his letter to me of June 9, both in response to my letter of June 7, which was printed in the body of the RECORD of June 10, 1952.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington. D. C., June 11, 1952.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR JOE: I am writing to you further with reference to the possibility of undertaking a program under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 for the leasing of the oil and gas deposits in the Continental Shelf.

As you know, this is not a new proposal. On the contrary, the exploration of this possibility was begun more than a year ago. The fact that the Department was considering the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 in this connection was publicized by the press rather widely in 1951, and Members of Congress who made inquiry were informed that the Department was exploring the possibility of utilizing the provisions of existing legislation for the leasing of the oil and gas deposits in the Continental Shelf. However, as I stated in my letter to you dated June 9, 1952, the proposal never progressed beyond the tentative stage.

In view of the public controversy that has arisen over the possibility of leasing the oil and gas deposits in the Continental Shelf under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, it seems reasonable to assume that, even if such a program were to be undertaken, the existing controversy would adversely affect the bidding for, and the development under, such leases. Consequently, I have recommended to the President, and he has concurred, that no further consideration be given by the executive branch to the possibility of inaugurating such a leasing program.

It is expected, therefore, that the oil and gas in the Continental Shelf will continue to be reserved and set aside, as stated in Executive Order 9633, pending the enactment of specific legislation to govern the development of these resources.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR,
Secretary of the Interior.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1952.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR JOE: I appreciate the time and effort that you devoted to the preparation of your letter dated June 7, 1952, regarding the possibility of inaugurating under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 a program for the leasing of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.

I am in complete agreement with you that the inauguration of such a program would be inconsistent with the statement in Executive Order 9633 that the resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf are "reserved, set aside, * * * pending the enactment of legislation in regard thereto." Throughout the consideration by this Department, over an extended period, of the possibility of utilizing the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 for the purpose of leasing the oil and gas deposits in the Continental Shelf, it has always been understood by the Department that the possibility depended, among other things, upon securing the prior approval of the President, evidenced by a revision of Executive order 9633. As of the present time, the President has not given his approval for the inauguration of a program looking toward the leasing of the oil and gas deposits in the Continental Shelf under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and the Department has not presented to the President any proposal for the revision of Executive Order 9633. (The Department, in connection with its consideration of this problem in 1951, prepared in rough-draft form a proposed amendatory Executive order along that line, but the rough draft was never transmitted outside the Department.)

If at some future time the President should revise Executive Order 9633 so as to remove the inhibition contained in the present language of the order with respect to the development of the resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf, the legal question as to whether the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 could properly be applied to the oil and gas in the Continental Shelf would then become real rather than academic, as it is at the present time.

With regard to this legal question, I am advised by the Solicitor of the Department that the primary problem is whether the oil and gas in the Continental Shelf come within the meaning of the term "property" as used in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and that Congress has defined the term "property" in that act (sec. 3 (d)) as meaning "any interest in property of any kind," with the exception of certain categories of property which have been expressly removed by Congress from the scope of the act, such as the public domain, national forests, national parks, etc.

The Solicitor adheres to the view that he expressed in the memorandum dated September 10, 1951, to the effect that the oil and gas in the Continental Shelf constitute property in which the United States has an interest. In support of his view, he refers to the fact that the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950)), makes it plain that the United States has both imperium (governmental powers of regulation and control) and dominium (ownership or proprietary rights) in the lands and minerals of the portion of the Continental Shelf underlying the marginal sea; and that the clear implication in the Texas decision, as well as in the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699 (1950)), is to the effect that the United States has the same rights in the lands and minerals of the Continental Shelf lying seaward of the marginal sea as it has in the lands and minerals of the Continental Shelf underlying the marginal sea.

If the Solicitor is correct in his view that the oil and gas in the Continental Shelf constitute property in which the United States has an interest, then the related legal question arises as to whether such property has been expressly excepted by the Congress from the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. In particular, the problem here is whether the lands of the Continental Shelf and their mineral deposits are included within the public domain exception prescribed by the Congress.

With respect to the problem mentioned in the preceding paragraph, it has long been held by the Supreme Court that the term "public domain" or "public lands," when used in Federal provisions of law relating to the disposition of land, does not include land lying seaward of the line of high tide along the coast. *Mann* v. *Tacoma Land Co.* (153 U. S. 273, 284 (1894)). This holding was not overruled by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Hynes* v. *Grimes Packing Co.* (337 U. S. 86 (1949)). That case involved, among other things, the interpretation of section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250; 48 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 358a), which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to designate as an Indian reservation any "public lands which are actually occupied by Indians or Eskimos" within the Territory of Alaska (as well as other lands specified in the section). Under the authority of this section, the Secretary issued an order which established the Karluk Indian Reservation on Kodiak Island and, where the reservation fronted on Shelikof Strait, placed within the boundaries of the reservation coastal waters to a distance of 3,000 feet from the shore line at mean low tide. The Court held that the statutory phrase previously quoted authorized the Secretary to include the coastal area within the boundaries of the reservation. The Court expressed the view that an interpretation of the statutory language so as "to describe only land above mean low tide is too restrictive in view of the history and habits of Alaska natives and the course of administration of Indian affairs in that territory" (pp. 110–111). The Court stressed that section 2 of the 1936 act "gives no power to the Secretary to dispose finally of Federal lands" or "to convey any permanent title or right to the Indians in the lands or waters of Karluk Reservation" (p. 102); and the Court indicated that it was the temporary character of the reservation, and the circumstance that the governing statutory provision was part of a series of legislative enactments designed to improve the economic condition of Alaskan natives, that distinguished the Hynes case from other cases holding that the term "public lands" does not include lands below the high watermark along the coast (pp. 115–116).

If the oil and gas in the Continental Shelf are property in which the United States has an interest, and if they are not within the scope of the public domain exception prescribed by Congress in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, then the problem concerning the possibility of disposing of such oil and gas under that act would become one (assuming a previous revision of Executive Order 9633 by the President) of determining, first, whether such oil and gas could properly be declared to be excess property, and, second, whether such oil and gas could properly be declared to be surplus property. These would be administrative problems, because the Congress has defined the term "excess property" to mean "any property under the control of any Federal agency which is not required for its needs and the discharge of its responsibilities, as determined by the head thereof" (sec. 3 (a)); and the Congress has defined the term "surplus property" to mean "any excess property not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of all Federal agencies, as determined by the Administrator" of General Services or his delegate (secs. 3 (g), 205 (d)). Thus, the determination as to whether oil or gas in the

Continental Shelf could properly be regarded as "excess property," as that term is defined in the act, would be made by the Secretary of the Interior as the head of the Federal agency having control of such oil and gas under Executive Order 9633; and, if the Secretary's determination on this point were in the affirmative as to any of the oil or gas in the Continental Shelf, then the determination as to whether such excess oil or gas could properly be regarded as "surplus property," as that term is defined in the act, would be made by the Administrator of General Services (or his delegate) after consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies. In particular, it would be necessary to consult with the Secretary of Defense in connection with any proposal to declare that oil or gas in the Continental Shelf was "not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of all Federal agencies." There has been no consultation thus far with representatives of the Department of Defense, or with representatives of other Government agencies, on this point.

As you will see from the foregoing discussion, the argument as to whether the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 could be applied to oil and gas in the Continental Shelf is academic, because the President has not indicated that he would revise Executive Order 9633 so as to remove the present inhibition against the development of the resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf pending the enactment of legislation on this subject, and because there has been no consultation thus far with the Department of Defense or other Federal agencies concerning the question whether any of the oil or gas in the Continental Shelf is "not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of all Federal agencies."

I agree with you that the Congress ought to furnish adequate guidance for the executive branch by legislating expressly with respect to the administration of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf and their mineral resources.

If you or your committee should desire further information or clarification on any phase of the question discussed above, or on any other matter pertaining to the administration of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, I should be glad to appear with Solicitor White for the purpose of attempting to furnish the desired information or clarification.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR,
Secretary of the Interior.

Address of Dr. Ralph J. Bunche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1952

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, my alma mater, St. Louis University, was founded in 1818 and was the first college established in the great Southwest area of the country. Within the past week at its annual commencement the graduating class of St. Louis University was addressed by Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Director of the United Nations Trustee Department, former professor at Harvard University, and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize. Dr. Bunche has attained distinction in the fields of education, of diplomacy, and of mediation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith excerpts of Dr. Bunche's address to the graduating class of St. Louis University on June 3 as printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 8:

It is truly said that the United Nations is the world's best hope for a peaceful, free, and secure world. But it is equally true that the United Nations cannot finally succeed in building firm foundations for world peace and stability, nor can any international mechanism or diplomacy, unless and until there is a sound moral foundation for its effort.

This foundation, acutely lacking today, can be found only among the peoples of the world—in their minds and hearts. Man's greatest challenge, therefore, is posed in human attitudes and relations.

Preparing the world for a peaceful existence is a mammoth educational process. Peoples who long for peace—and I believe that there are no peoples in the world who do not, whatever the motivations and policies of some governments may be—must learn and apply the elemental lessons which are indispensable to peaceful relations among men. In this regard, every community, every institution, every individual has a serious international responsibility.

For example, we in this democratic society are accustomed to responsible and responsive government. It is fundamental to the effective operation of our system of government that the people shall be alert and well-informed on the issues and problems confronting the society and its government.

The new role of leadership in international affairs now assumed by the American Government, marking a radical departure from its traditional policy of aloofness, involves new burdens and responsibilities for the American citizen. It is essential that the American citizen be equally as well-informed and capable of formulating his views and expressing his wishes on international as on domestic issues. As never before in our history, his well-being, present and future, is directly involved in the foreign policy of his Government.

The representatives of the Government who sit in the organs of the United Nations, in the specialized agencies and other international bodies, are acting on behalf of the American people. They regularly take positions and vote on a wide variety of questions which, relating vitally to the establishment of a peaceful, just, and stable world order, are of utmost concern to the American citizenry. They are, in effect, our representatives in the international parliament, and they need the guidance of the people's will.

The imperative horizon of the American citizen has thus vastly widened within the past few years. His knowledge and active interest, his understanding of other peoples, must expand correspondingly if our democratic structure is to continue strong and effective.

In assessing the prospects for peace or war nowadays, one inevitably thinks primarily in terms of the possibility of resolving—or at least easing—the conflict between west and east. This conflict is much more than the traditional struggles for military, political, and economic power.

It is also an ideological conflict, involving the necessity of winning men's hearts and minds as well as physical control over them.

People are the major stakes at issue. Its outcome cannot be determined solely on battlefields. Ideas cannot be fought decisively with guns, nor can minds and hearts be won with them.

In this momentous struggle, earnest, active concern for human progress and the well-being of people everywhere, of whatever race, religion, or culture, will prove by far to be our most effective weapon.

Indeed, the conflict between West and East is nurtured and sharpened by the stark fact that substantially more than half of the world's people for long have lived and still live under miserable conditions. In varying degree, poverty, hunger, squalor, disease, ignorance, and oppression comprise their typical way of life. But they are now awakened and aroused and clamorously demand a much better life.

In Asia, the Middle East, and much of Africa, there is vigorous ferment—not over ideologies, not over the relative merits of free versus authoritarian systems of government and economy, but simply over intolerable conditions of life. This is the outstanding phenomenon of our times, overshadowing in its ultimate significance even conflict with communism.

Indeed, these peoples may prove to be the decisive factor in the ultimate outcome of that conflict. They can be won to the cause of peace and freedom if there is understanding and sympathy with their aspirations and if the true hand of equality and fellowship is extended to them along with the technical and material assistance they require.

The United Nations well understands this and seeks greater social justice, larger freedom, and a better life for all peoples.

In this regard, I might most appropriately quote from the statement made by the Delegate of the Holy See to the United States on May 21, on the occasion of his first visit to the United Nations Headquarters in New York for the purpose of signing the Convention relative to the Statute of Refugees. Affirming that the Supreme Pontiff, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII "has not ceased to point out to the peoples of the world the way to lasting peace and social restoration by mutual cooperation and by recognition of the supreme moral values," Archbishop Cicognani went on to say:

"With ardent hope the world turns to the United Nations and anxiously follows the struggle of its distinguished leaders to overcome tremendous obstacles and to restore to forsaken people peace, home, employment, and justice."

The crisis now confronting mankind is a world-wide crisis in human relations. It is the menacing culmination of centuries of human greed and callousness. It cannot be resolved by guns and bombs. It can be resolved without guns by understanding generosity and firm espousal of the right of all people to freedom, equality, dignity, and the enjoyment of at least those minimum standards of living to which all human beings are entitled.

In this connection, let us also, as Americans, never forget that in our own society we have a grave problem of human relations, as yet unresolved despite the great progress that has been recorded. It is today a more serious and costly problem than ever before.

In the contemporary world, democracy as we conceive of it, our way of life, is being severely challenged. We believe, and rightly so, that democracy, insuring the freedom, equality, dignity, and initiative of the individual, is the best blueprint for living ever devised for self-respecting men.

It is vital not only to our own future, but to the cause of freedom throughout the world, that we afford a convincing demonstration of the virility of democracy as a way of life for all people, irrespective of color or creed. We must practice democracy as vigorously as we profess it.

Surely nothing could be fairer or simpler than that all Americans should be accepted and appraised as individuals on the basis of their individual merit. Democracy, the spirit of brotherhood, and Christian ethics demand no more than this; nor does the Negro.

ported the omnibus immigration bills, and he referred to certain provisions of the proposed legislation as a milestone in American history. Again, in a letter to Senator McCARRAN, dated May 8, 1952, Mr. Mohler virtually states that the NCWC has supported the legislation.

In my opinion, Mr. Mohler's statement and his letter do not represent the considered thinking of the bishops of the United States. They are certainly at variance with the attitudes expressed by representatives of Catholic organizations at a meeting held on March 3, 1952, to discuss policies of immigration legislation. It is hard to understand why the statement was made or the letter written. The legislation proposed by Senator McCARRAN deserves no such support.

EXCLUSION BILL

Despite the superficial tidying-up done in conference, the McCarran-Walter bill codifying and revising the country's immigration and naturalization statutes remains a profoundly disappointing and dangerous measure. It makes numerous changes in the unsatisfactory existing laws dealing with aliens. But it retains and intensifies the underlying exclusionist philosophy which characterized the Immigration Act of 1924. Moreover, it authorizes harsh and summary proceedings in the treatment of aliens—proceedings altogether inconsistent with American institutions. In general the bill is no better, and in some respects it is worse, than existing law. We urge the President to veto it.

As we see it, there are three major defects in the McCarran-Walter bill. First of all, it transforms naturalization into an uncertain and inferior class of citizenship. Under its terms, if, within 5 years of his naturalization, a citizen joins any organization which the Attorney General considers a Communist-front, the mere act of joining, regardless of the motive or intent, may be taken as prima facie evidence of fraud in obtaining citizenship and may be penalized by denaturalization. It also provides that a naturalized citizen may lose his citizenship if, within 10 years of obtaining it, he should refuse to testify before a congressional committee investigating subversive activities. Neither of these punitive provisions applies to native-born citizens; a naturalized citizen would be less free than one who was native-born. The effect is not only to make naturalized citizenship uncertain but also to frighten and intimidate and thus restrict the rights of naturalized citizens. We think the distinction between classes of citizenship profoundly un-American.

Second, the bill would in some instances harshly limit the discretion of the Attorney General to temper justice with mercy in dealing with aliens and in other instances would put into his hands—or into the hands of consuls and immigration officers—arbitrary power to exclude or deport aliens, with inadequate opportunities for appeal to the courts. The United States ought to deal with aliens no less justly than with citizens; and judicial review, we have learned, is a necessary means of assuring justice.

Finally, the bill is animated by xenophobia. It treats immigration as an evil and a liability rather than as an asset and a source of strength, as it has been in the past. It not only sets up numerous new grounds for exclusion and for deportation—even abolishing statutes of limitation in deportation cases—but it restricts immigration to the trickle of the past couple of decades. The number of aliens admissible under the proposed law would be virtually identical with those admissible under the present law. This is accomplished by basing quota provisions, as in the past, upon the 1920 census. They ought to be based upon current census figures and they ought to be liberalized. This Nation has grown to greatness through enrichment of its culture and its population from the Old World. It would be tragic to forsake its great traditions for the spurious protectionism of a McCarran wall.

The Offshore Oil Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16, 1952

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excellent editorials from the New York Times of May 20, 1952, and the Washington Post of June 10, 1952, with reference to the so-called tidelands oil joint resolution which was recently vetoed by the President.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 20, 1952]

THE OFFSHORE OIL BILL

The offshore oil bill, nullifying three Supreme Court decisions which held that the Federal Government has paramount rights over the lands beneath the marginal seas, has now passed both Houses of Congress. The President has vetoed similar legislation once before and we hope and expect that he will do as much again.

The pending measure, known as the Holland bill, would definitely grant to the coastal States title to underwater lands out to their historic boundaries—3 miles in most cases but up to 10½ miles in others. The issue of Federal versus State control became acute only after the discovery and development of huge oil deposits under the marginal seas off the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana, and it is the fight over this estimated reserve of 15,000,000,000 barrels of oil that gives this interesting legal battle an immense practical importance. The States claim that they always had owned the areas in dispute; but the precise question had never been adjudicated by the Supreme Court until 1947, when a decision was rendered in favor of the Federal Government, a decision twice repeated in 1950.

One of the most widely employed arguments for overturning the decision of the highest court is this: To grant the Federal Government paramount rights in the offshore oil lands is to threaten State ownership of all navigable waters, including the land underlying all bays and harbors, all navigable rivers and lakes, as Commissioner Moses puts it. We do not think for a moment that this is what the Supreme Court decisions imply, and the Federal Government throughout the long history of this litigation has never remotely advanced such a far-fetched claim. In fact, its spokesmen have repeatedly disavowed it.

But even if the historic background to the dispute be ignored there is and for years has been an entirely adequate legislative remedy at hand. Administration bills have repeatedly and vainly been introduced explicitly to grant to the States title to underwater land shoreward of low-water mark, for the express purpose of removing once and for all this irrelevant argument from the fight over offshore oil, which is properly a fight over ownership of land seaward of low-water mark.

A similar provision is in the Holland bill; but it surely is not necessary for Congress to quitclaim tremendously valuable property beneath the marginal seas that the Supreme Court says is under dominion of the Federal Government in order to assure the States that the Federal Government has no design on property beneath inland waters or on State-owned water-front developments.

No; the real issue is whether the Federal Government or the States will control this great offshore reservoir containing one of the Nation's most valuable natural resources. The exploitation will be carried on by private companies in either case. If the quitclaim bill stands each of the coastal States lucky enough to find oil beneath its marginal sea will develop the oil in its own way, and a multi-billion-dollar asset will be used principally for the benefit of the people of three, or perhaps half a dozen, States. If the quitclaim bill can be beaten back, and the Congress can be persuaded to pass the O'Mahoney bill allowing the Government to supervise the oil reserves under one nationally consistent policy, we think that the major benefit would go where it should go, to the people of all of the 48 States.

[From the Washington Post of June 10, 1952]

TIDELANDS VETO

The very title of the so-called tidelands oil bill is a fraud. It purports to be a joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. But the resolution adopted by Congress, and vetoed a fortnight ago by the President, has nothing to do, in point of fact, with lands within State boundaries. It has nothing whatever to do with inland waters or with "tidelands," a term which is properly applied only to the narrow strip of land lying between high tide and low tide. It deals, rather, with land lying seaward of the tidelands, beyond the inland waters and wholly outside State boundaries, the strip between the low-tide mark and the 3-mile limit properly called the marginal sea.

Now, it is impossible for Congress "to confirm * * * the titles of the States" to these lands for the simple reason that the States, as component parts of the Federal Union, have never had any titles to them. Our authority for this assertion is the Supreme Court of the United States, a body created by the Constitution for the express purpose of settling controversies of this sort. The Supreme Court, although it has held repeatedly that the States do indeed have title to their inland waters, ruled unequivocally in the California case of 1947 that California had no title to the marginal sea and that paramount rights in and full domain over the area rested in the United States as a sovereign Nation. Texas enjoyed such rights and dominion during the decade of her independence but relinquished them upon relinquishing her national sovereignty when she joined the United States.

What Congress attempted to do, therefore, in its tidelands resolution was to give away to three coastal States, California, Texas, and Louisiana, lands and mineral resources which belong to the people of the whole American Union. President Truman sent this resolution back to Congress with a forceful and compelling veto message, because, he said, "I do not believe such an action would be in the national interest, and I do not see how any President could fail to oppose it." For our part, we do not see how any Congress acting as a legislature of the United States could fail to sustain a veto on these grounds.

A strange sort of frenzy seems, however, to have taken hold of the officials of a great many interior States of the Union which have nothing to gain and everything to lose from quitclaim legislation. They have allowed themselves to be bamboozled into a

belief that somehow or other the Supreme Court's ruling in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases has cast doubt on the status of lands beneath their navigable inland waters. The fear is, of course, an altogether groundless one. Its groundlessness was made abundantly clear by the President when he declared in his veto message, "If the Congress wishes to enact legislation confirming the States in the ownership of what is already there—that is, the lands and resources under navigable inland waters and the tidelands—I shall, of course, be glad to approve it. But such legislation is completely unnecessary, and bears no relation whatever to the question of what should be done with lands which the States do not now own—that is, the lands under an open sea."

Apart from the constitutional issue involved, the President pointed out in his veto message the importance of keeping the oil of the marginal sea under Federal management in order to conserve it for national defense purposes. He pointed out, too, the tremendous benefits that could accrue to the Nation as a whole by devoting the revenue to be derived from exploitation of the marginal sea to a program of Federal aid to education in the manner proposed not long ago by Senator HILL. These ought to be compelling considerations to Members of Congress whose business it is to serve national, not merely local or sectional, interests. The Senate will be tested as a national body when it votes this week on a motion to override the President's veto. We hope that the veto will be sustained.

America's Security Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 16, 1952

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last Friday in Seattle, Wash., the chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Mr. Jack Gorrie, made what I believe to be a significant report to the country on the state of America's security resources. It is a report which I think could well be read by every Senator and Representative.

Of particular importance is Mr. Gorrie's report on the trend toward selection of dispersed sites for new American industrial facilities. This is true because our national industrial dispersion policy is based on voluntary site selection by the businessman who wants to build a new plant, and upon community cooperation in the designation of dispersed industrial areas.

As an advisory body to the President, the National Security Resources Board is necessarily a comparatively anonymous organization. Nevertheless, this report of the Board's Chairman shows how broadly and how clearly it covers its statutory assignment of advising the President on the coordination of military and civilian mobilization programs. Jack Gorrie has performed an excellent service in rebuilding the Board staff and bringing its work up to the stature intended for it when Congress passed the National Security Act of 1947.

Mr. President, I ask that the address of Mr. Jack Gorrie before the Armed Forces Day luncheon of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S SECURITY RESOURCES

It is a privilege to join with the Seattle Chamber of Commerce in observing Armed Forces Day.

No region of America has given more meaning to Armed Forces Day than has the Pacific Northwest.

We salute the men and women of the military services—our land, sea, and air forces. Observances such as this demonstrate the unity of American civilians with those who are under arms in these critical times.

More than 3 years in Washington-on-the-Potomac has impressed me that Seattle is perhaps more aware of these critical times than many metropolitan centers in the Nation.

To those of us with national security resources planning responsibility, Seattle has been of tremendous help. I do not think you will have difficulty in recalling the shock 3 years ago, when the question was raised as to whether the Pacific Northwest was safe as an industrial location. With the help of your civic-minded leaders, a plan was developed to answer this question.

I refer to the accomplishment of the industrial dispersion task force sponsored by the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. The Seattle plan led to the establishment of a national industrial dispersion policy by President Truman. Up to now, 57 of the most important metropolitan areas which produce the bulk of our defense needs have committees operating under this plan. Many more are in various stages of organization.

The important work of these committees is now really under way. Just last week, the Defense Production Administration adopted a new procedure—developed after months of careful consideration. It requires each person applying for a certificate of necessity for rapid tax amortization to submit a statement from the local industrial dispersion committee as to whether the plant site conforms to national dispersion standards.

What DPA is asking for is advice—advice from the local committee. If the committee can say "we have checked the location of this plant and find that it is adequately dispersed with respect to the national standards," DPA will accept the committee's word for it.

If, however, the plant site happens to be within a concentrated area, or too close to it, there may be a good and necessary reason for that. In such cases, the local industrial dispersion committee may advise DPA of the justification for granting an exception to the dispersion standards. Then the officials in Washington who have the responsibility for carrying out this program can make an intelligent decision—based on local advice—as to whether the site should be approved or the applicant advised to seek another location.

We have been getting a great deal of dispersion in the location of new defense plants since the Korean conflict began—and we have had this disperson without any coercive action whatever on the part of the Federal Government.

Results of a survey of the exact location of plants in the 48 States have been most gratifying.

It is true that some important plants have gone into some of the more congested areas. In many cases, that was unavoidable.

But our survey shows that 49 percent of the defense expansions costing $1,000,000 or more were located outside the industrial metropolitan areas (those having 40,000 or more workers). Just 33 percent are in the suburban metropolitan areas. And only 18 percent of the plants are located inside the central cities of industrial metropolitan areas.

If we look at the investment value of these plants, the dispersion picture is even better.

Dollarwise, out of 900 plants with a total investment of $7,750,000,000, only 12 percent are going inside the central cities of industrial metropolitan areas. Forty-two percent of the investment is going into the suburban areas and the remaining 46 percent is located in the outlying sections.

Actually, under the national industrial dispersion standards, most of the plants in the suburban areas are dispersed. Many of the metropolitan areas, as designated by the Census Bureau, include several counties surrounding a central city. There is plenty of room in most of these metropolitan areas for new industrial facilities to locate—and still be 10 miles or more from any congested section.

Does this mean there is no need for further dispersion?

Not at all. There still are 19 central cities which contain more than half of the Nation's defense production capacity. We still have certain industries of which far too great a proportion is located in one or two cities. The Defense Production Administration still is receiving new applications for tax amortization certificates at the rate of a hundred or more per week.

There is a very vital need for continuing our efforts to encourage the location of even more new plants in places which will not enhance the attractiveness of our cities as targets for enemy attack.

That is the job which is being done by these local industrial dispersion committees.

There is another side to the results of our survey. It proves that the trend toward dispersed locations is economically sound. It proves that this program, which you in Seattle developed in conjunction with the National Security Resources Board is fair and practicable, as well as in the best interests of national defense.

This is a Federal program in which the major responsibility has been handed to the people of the communities themselves.

Geographically, the Pacific Northwest is closer to the Soviet Union than any other region of the United States. Within the boundaries of Washington and Oregon is a multi-billion dollar national stake in military bases, posts, and installations, in shipyards, hydroelectric power houses, dams, atomic energy plants, aluminum and magnesium works, the production and processing of food, lumber, plywood and other wood products.

Speaking as a native son, when we in the Pacific Northwest industrialized in earnest, we experienced one of the greatest economic booms in recent national history. When prophets of doom predicted the collapse of our industry with the end of World War II, we confounded them by adapting ourselves to new conditions, and continued with our boom. We are still industrializing, and we know that materials will be made in our own industrial plants. By the same token, we are pressing for completion of new power projects in the Columbia River Basin, so that we won't again be faced with a brownout threat, as we were a little less than a year ago.

All of this means, of course, that this region offers prime targets for an aggressor. Is such an attack really possible?

Let us examine the nature of the only state from which an unprovoked attack is to be feared. We know that the Korean aggression is only one salient in the Kremlin offensive toward world domination. The Soviets will strike with political or military weapons, wherever they think they have the capability to win. We know that their strategic objectives remain the same even though their tactics and the settings may